The Tocharian Verbal System

Melanie Malzahn

CONTENTS

THE SUBJUNCTIVE STEM

THE PRESENT STEM

THE IMPERATIVE

VERBAL INDEX

REFERENCES

INDICES

xviii

<div align="right">
Melanie Malzahn
Cambridge, Massachusetts
March 2010
</div>

Methodological Considerations

The main goal of this work is to present the Tocharian verbal system in a systemic way. In contrast to the nominal system of Tocharian, which clearly shows many innovations with respect to what may reasonably be reconstructed as the PIE system, the Tocharian verbal system has often been considered as archaic and far more conservative, and hence important for the reconstruction of the PIE system. The main focus of my work lies in establishing the synchronic verbal systems of Tocharian A and B. With respect to methodology, I proceed by the following steps as recommended by Winter, 1994a, 285 = 2005, 466:

    1. Comprehensive collection of the data, which are presented in the verbal index in part II, to which reference is made in the main part by, e.g., "see *käm-* 'come', s.v.".

    2. Comparative reconstruction of the (pre-)PT system based on common features shared by both Tocharian languages;

    3. Internal reconstruction of the (pre-)PT system in case the two languages differ;

    4. Comparison of the reconstructed pre-PT system with the evidence provided by the other branches of PIE. I did not start out with any preconception of the place of the Tocharian branch among the other IE branches, and I will not explicitly address this vexed question at all. Nevertheless, I hope my findings will prove useful also in this respect.

The Text Corpus

As a rule, I quote forms as transliterated in the respective standard edition, unless otherwise stated. As for as yet unedited words and passages and their translation, in cases where I rely on someone else's information I always quote that authority for the reading and/or translation, and if no such reference is given, the reading/translation is my own. For a description of the different collections, see Malzahn, 2007d, 79ff.

Berlin collection

The Berlin collection has been used more or less completely. Beside the texts edited in TochSprR(A) and TochSprR(B) and those scattered over different articles, I also could make use of the edition of KVāc by Klaus T. Schmidt in his unpublished habilitation thesis. For the unedited remainder, which is still the major unedited part, I rely on my own readings of the photographs as published on TITUS and of the original manuscripts and also on the preliminary edition by Tamai, 2007a.

Paris collection

Consisting of nearly 2000 pieces, as per Pinault, 2007, 163ff., the greater part of the Paris collection still awaits edition and even publication. In the summer of 2005 and 2009 I had the opportunity to work with the majority of the unpublished texts together with Georges-Jean Pinault in Paris, and most of the word forms and passages from this part used here are quoted according to his transliterations.

London collection

Apart from my own readings based on the photographs available on the web site of the *International Dunhuang Project*, I also could make use of the edition by J. W. Broomhead in his unpublished Ph.D. dissertation and of the recent preliminary edition by Peyrot, 2007 and Tamai, 2007.

ABBREVIATIONS AND CONVENTIONS FOR QUOTATIONS

In general, I do not mark Tocharian B forms, whereas Tocharian A forms are marked by 'TA'. Similarly, Tocharian B roots go unmarked, whereas Tocharian A roots are marked by a superscript ^{A}. I generally quote TB word forms and roots as default forms.

SIGNATURES AND QUOTATIONS OF PASSAGES

I generally use the simplified system of transcription for Tocharian word forms and text passages, as per TEB I, 40f., § 7,2, unless the word form or text passage quoted is edited or published here for the first time. In this case I use the system of transliteration as adopted in *Tocharische Sprachreste*. In the simplified system of transcription the "Fremdzeichen" like *ka*, etc., are transcribed by *kä*, etc., while virāma position and silent *ä* in virāma position is not indicated, i.e., *ka* = *k*, -*wä* = *w*, etc. When quoting forms from unpublished small fragments, I did not try to figure out how many lines the whole text might have had, but usually quote the line(s) as they are still visible on the fragment.

Symbols used in transliteration

////	lacuna of unknown length
( )	restored akṣara(s)
[ ]	damaged akṣara(s)
–	lacuna of one single akṣara
·	illegible part of an akṣara
{ }	superfluous akṣara(s) or part thereof
< >	missing grapheme without lacuna in the original manuscript
⟪ ⟫	interlinear correction
•	punctuation mark
| |	double daṇḍa
superscription	silent vowel in virāma position
=	(vowel) sandhi

Symbols used in translations of Tocharian, Sanskrit and Old Turkish passages

( )   restoration of completely damaged/missing words and parts of words

[ ]   additional word(s) without equivalent in the original, and/or additional information on the meaning of the passage

In quoted translations of Tocharian, Sanskrit, and Old Turkish passages I leave the symbols and brackets as they are in the original. However, in these quotes I use

{ }   for additions or deviations from the original translation

{...}   for omission of word(s) from the original translation.

Apart from translations, I use the following brackets in quotes:

[ ]   additions or deviations from the original

[...]   omission of word(s) of the original.

TOCHARIAN TEXTS

a = recto side of a manuscript
b = verso side of a manuscript

I quote the side of a manuscript generally according to the authoritative edition; if there is a deviation from said edition, I indicate that fact by "a [= recte b]".

Texts edited in TochSprR(B) are not given a signature, these are just quoted by their respective edition number, e.g. 45 a 4 = TochSprR(B) 45 or A 23 b 4 = TochSprR(A) 23.

A = Berlin collection, Tocharian A texts edited in TochSprR(A).

A(Ud.) = Udānālaṁkāra, ed. by Lévi, 1933, 72ff.

Amb = Ambarajātaka (= M 500, 4/5 = PK NS 32); ed. by Lévi, 1912, reedited by Thomas, 1965.

AS = Ancienne Série (part of the Paris collection PK).

bi = Middle Iranian texts in Brāhmī script from the Berlin Turfan collection (at DTA).

BM = British Museum, text from the Stein collection formerly kept in the British Museum with the catalogue number Or. 8212 (163) [Or. 52], ed. Broomhead I, 106f.

Ch = Chien-Fo-Tung (Miŋ-öy, qiānfódòng = Dunhuang; site indication used by Stein).

PK Cp = Comptabilités de couvents (= PK DA M. 507, = PR). Monastery records from the Paris collection.

D = Dakianus(-Stadt) (= Xočo, site indication used by the German expeditions).

DA = Douldour-âqour (= Duldur-akhur; site indication used by the French expeditions).

DA M = Douldour-âqour, manuscrit = PK DA M. 507 = PR = PK Cp.

Dd = Documents divers, inscriptions on objects and wall graffiti from the Paris collection, ed. by Pinault, 1987, 180ff.

DTA = Digitales Turfanarchiv (Berlin).

Fill. M = Magical-medical text from the Paris collection ed. by Filliozat, 1948; see also Sieg, 1955.

Fill. P = "Pelliot", medical text of the Paris collection, ed. by Filliozat, 1948; see also Sieg, 1955.

Fill. W = "Weber/Macartney" manuscript, ed. by Filliozat, 1948; see also Sieg, 1955.

Fill. Y = Yogaśataka, ed. by Filliozat, 1948; see also Sieg, 1955, reed. by Carling, 2003a.

FK = Fonds koutchéen, text no. 1205 and no. 590 (= PK NS 40) ed. by van Windekens, 1940, Tab. I-IV; see also E. Sieg/W. Siegling apud Couvreur, 1948, 327ff.

(PK) Gn = Old subseries of the Paris collection used by Walter Couvreur and subsequently J. W. Broomhead.

G-Su = Graffite de Soubachi (see Pinault, 1987).

H = Text of the Hoernle collection.

HMR = Hoernle Manuscript Remains, three texts ed. by Lévi in Hoernle, 1916, 356ff. HMR 1 = H 149.X 3, HMR 2 = H 149.X 4, HMR 3 = H. 149.X 5. Several new editions.

HW(B) = Administrative texts published in facsimile by Huang Wenbi, 1958.

IA = Innermost Asia, refers to texts published in Stein, 1928.

IOL = India Office Library (London).

K = Karmavibhaṅga, ed. by Lévi, 1933; see also Sieg, 1938.

KVāc = Karmavācanā (text from the Berlin collection), ed. by Schmidt, 1986.

PK LC = Lettres Commerciales, administrative texts from the Paris collection.

LP = Laissez-Passer, caravan travel passports of the Paris collection, comprehensive edition by Pinault, 1987.

M = Murtuq (site indication used by the German expeditions).

Mainz = Subseries of the Berlin collection, refers to fragments brought to the *Mainzer Akademie der Wissenschaften* in 1947.

Man.Bil. = Tocharian B-Old Turkish bilingual text in Manichaean script, ed. by von Gabain/Winter, 1958.

MQ = Ming-öi Qizil, site indication used by the German expeditions. Note that I use MQ not only in the strict sense of texts coming from the Ming-öi of Qizil, but also as an abbreviation for so-called MQ character; see chap. Sound Laws (chap. 1).

MSN = Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka, play in Tocharian A transmitted in several manuscripts from the Berlin collection and by the YQ manuscript.

NS = Nouvelle Série (part of the Paris collection PK).

Or. = Oriental Collections, British Museum/British Library inventory siglum.

Ot. = Text of the Otani collection.

Pä = "Pässe", caravan travel passports of the Paris collection ed. by Lévi, 1913, 313ff. as cited by the Sieg School. Reedited by Pinault, 1987 with the new siglum LP (see above).

Pe = Two texts from the Petrovsky collection kept in St. Petersburg, first ed. by Leumann, 1900, 16f.

PK = Fonds Pelliot Koutchéen, kept in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France.

PB = Siglum used by the Sieg School only for wooden tablets of the Paris collection (= now PK Bois).

PR = "Pariser Rechnungen", siglum used by the Sieg School for the series PK DA M. 507 (see PK Cp above).

Qu = Qumtura (site indication used by the German expeditions).

S = Sängim (site indication used by German expeditions).

S = Udānastotra, ed. by Lévi, 1933, reed. by Thomas, 1966a.

Š = Šorčuq (site indication used by the German expeditions).

Ser = Serindia, refers to texts published in Stein, 1921.

SI = SerIndia, Collection of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Arts and Sciences, St. Petersburg.

St. = Stein collection, London.

T = Toyoq (site indication used by the German expeditions).

THT = Tocharische Handschriften der (Berliner) Turfan(sammlung), current standard inventory system for any Tocharian texts from the Berlin collection now kept by the State Library at Berlin.

T.P. = Text from the Berezovsky collection (St. Petersburg) edited by Lévi, 1913, 320, fn. 1 (also quoted as Pä 320, see above).

TX = Udānavarga texts described by Bernhard, 1965, 79f., ed. by
    Thomas, 1974.
U = Udānavarga, ed. by Lévi, 1933.
X = Text of the Berlin collection with unknown find spot.
Y = Yarχoto (site indication used by the German expeditions).
YQ = Yanqi Qianfodong ("1000 Buddha Grottos of Yanqi"),
    abbreviation for the MSN manuscripts ed. by Ji/Winter/Pinault,
    1998.
Z = Old Siglum of Berlin texts formerly kept in the *Museum für
    Indische Kunst.*

OLD TURKISH TEXTS

I basically follow the transcription of UW I, 9f. Passages from the Old
Turkish *Maitrisimit* are quoted by the version name, chapter number,
manuscript number, verso/recto side of the manuscript and line, e.g.,
MaitrSäŋim (XVI) 51 a 3 = Säŋim version, chapter 16, leaf 51, recto,
line 3.

MaitrHami = Hami version of *Maitrisimit*
MaitrSäŋim = Säŋim version of *Maitrisimit*
U = Old Turkish Texts of the Berlin Turfan Collection

SANSKRIT AND PALI TEXTS

Abhidh-k = Abhidharmakośa
BhīPāt = Bhikkhunīpātimokkha
CV = Cullavagga
CPS = Catuṣpariṣatsūtra
Dhp = Dhammapada
DN = Dīghanikāya
Divy = Divyāvadāna
KaVā = Karmavācanā
NiḥsPāt = Niḥsargikā-Pātayantikā part of Prātimokṣasūtra
Pāc = Pācittiya part of Pātimokkha
Pār = Pārājikā part of Prātimokṣasūtra
Pāt = Pātayantikā part of Prātimokṣasūtra
Pātim = Pātimokkha
PPU = Mātr̥ceṭa, Śatapañcāśatka
Śaikṣ = Śaikṣa part of Prātimokṣasūtra
SHT = Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden

PrMoSū = Prātimokṣasūtra
SN = Saṃyuttanikāya
Uv = Udānavarga
VAV = Varṇārhavarṇa
VinVibh = Vinayavibhaṅga

GRAMMATICAL ABBREVIATIONS

Abl. Ablative
Abs. Absolutive
Abstr. Abstract
a activum tantum
a+ activum tantum + *m*-Part
act. active
All. Allative
Antigv. Antigrundverb
Caus. Causal
Com. Comitative
fem./f. feminine
Ger Gerundive
Gv. Grundverb
Imp Imperfect
Inf Infinitive
Instr. Instrumental
itr. intransitive
Ipv Imperative
Kaus. Kausativum
Loc. Locative

m medium tantum
m+ medium tantum + *nt*-Part
m-Part *m*-Present participle
masc./m. masculine
mid. middle
n. neuter
nt-Part *nt*-Present Participle
Opt Optative
Part Participle
pass. passive
Perl. Perlative
PPt Preterit participle
Priv Privative
Prs Present
Pt Preterit
Sub Subjunctive
Subcl. Subclass
tr. transitive
x both active and middle voice
   attested

(VIII/I/III) (a+/x/m)
Round brackets like this with three entries after a given root indicate the class number of the present, subjunctive, and preterit class made from that root and the voice pattern to be found in them. Accordingly, this example would indicate that the root has an activum tantum present Class VIII with an *m*-present participle, a subjunctive of Class I showing both voices, and a medium tantum preterit of Class III. If a stem class is unattested or no finite forms are found, this is indicated by a small dash (-). If more than one present/subjunctive, preterit stem

is attested both class numbers are listed and separated by a small dash such as (I-II). In case the class is ambiguous, the possible class numbers are joined by an "o" (for *or*), such as (IoII). In case of stems showing mixed formations (such as thematized forms in a basically thematic stem), this is indicated by a plus sign such as (I+II).

LANGUAGES

Aeol. Aeolic dialect of Ancient Greek
Anat. Anatolian
Arm. Armenian
Av. Avestan
BHS Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit
Dor. Doric dialect of Ancient Greek
Germ. Germanic
Gk. Greek
Go. Gothic
Hitt. Hittite
IIr. Indo-Iranian
Ion.-Att. Ionic-Attic dialect of Ancient Greek
Khot. Khotanese
Lat. Latin
Lith. Lithuanian
Luv. Luvian

ModHG Modern High German
NWGmc. North West Germanic
PT Proto-Tocharian
PIE Proto-Indo-European
OAv. Old Avestan
OCS Old Church Slavonic
OIce. Old Icelandic
OIr. Old Irish
ON Old Nordic
Osc.-U. Oscan-Umbrian
Pā. Pāli
Skt. Sanskrit
TA Tocharian A
TB Tocharian B
Tib. Tibetan
Ved. Vedic Sanskrit
YAv. Young Avestan

JOURNALS AND SERIES

AGI Archivio Glottologico Italiano
AoF Altorientalische Forschungen
AO Archiv Orientální
BEI Bulletin d'Études Indiennes
BiOr Bibliotheca Orientalis
BSOAS Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
CAJ Central Asiatic Journal
CRAI Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres
CWPL Copenhagen Working Papers in Linguistics
GGA Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen

HS Historische Sprachforschung
IF Indogermanische Forschungen
IIJ Indo-Iranian Journal
IJDL International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics
JA Journal Asiatique
JAOS Journal of the American Oriental Society
JIES Journal of Indo-European Studies
KZ Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung
Lg Language
MSL Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris
MSS Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft
NGAW Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen
OLZ Orientalische Literaturzeitung
RBPh Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire
REArm Revue des Études Arméniennes
REIE Revue des Études Indo-Européennes
SbWGF Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der
Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main
SEC Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia
SHT Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden
SPAW Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der
    Wissenschaften
TIES Tocharian and Indo-European Studies
ZDMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft

MISCELLANEOUS

ed. edition, edited	s.v. sub voce
frg. fragment	transl. translation
hg. herausgegeben	Übers. Übersetzung
ms(s) manuscript(s)	vel sim. vel simile
publ. published	viz. videlicet
scil. scilicet	

BASIC REMARKS ABOUT THE PHONOLOGICAL SYSTEM AND SOUND LAWS

Since this book is not a historical grammar of Tocharian, but just a presentation of its verbal system, I cannot give a detailed account of all aspects of its synchronic and diachronic phonology here; in what follows, I will concentrate on those phonological traits that are relevant to verbal matters.

Above all, Tocharian B is not at all a uniform language; for detailed information about my own views on the various chronological and dialectal layers see Malzahn, 2007a, 255ff. and also most recently Peyrot, 2008, passim. Basically, we have, on the one hand, to do with manuscripts showing what was called "MQ character" by Krause (WTG, 1ff.), i.e., a more archaic layer of the TB language that is mostly preserved in documents coming from the site of Ming-öi Qizil (= MQ),[1] and some of these documents are also paleographically archaic. On the other hand, many documents of profane nature show traits of a language that can safely be regarded as a more progressive or informal variety, in contrast to the standard variety in which the majority of Tocharian manuscripts is written. It is also apparent that the eastern variety of Tocharian B, i.e., the one coming from the remote Turfan oasis, had many characteristics of that progressive or informal-style variety even in documents of non-profane nature, and, in my opinion, some cases of these special features are reminiscent of neighboring Tocharian A.

1.1. THE ESSENTIAL OUTCOMES OF PIE SYLLABICS AND LARYNGEALS

There is no unanimity about how to set up, and how to denote the vowel system(s) of prehistorical Tocharian. At any rate, it is at least quite common to distinguish between an earlier and a later stage of prehistorical Tocharian in its development. In what follows, I will use

---

[1] Note that for the sake of convenience I will use the abbreviation MQ for texts of so-called MQ character even when they hail from other sites such as Duldur-akhur.

the terms "Proto-Tocharian" (PT) for a stage one could also reasonably call "Common Tocharian". Repeatedly it will prove necessary to make a further distinction between "Early Proto-Tocharian" and "Late Proto-Tocharian".

As for the late PIE vowels and diphthongs, I assume the following developments and use the following notations:

PIE	pre-PT	(Late) PT	TA	TB
*ah$_2$(_C), *ā	*ā	*å̄	*a*	*o*
*oH(_C), *ō	*ō	*ā	*ā*	*ā/a*
*H(C_C and U_(C)#),[2] *a	*a	*ā	*ā*	*ā/a*
*i, *u	*i, *u	*(')ä	*ä*	*a/ä*
*e	*e	*'ä	*ä*	*a/ä*
*iH(_C-), *ī[2]	*ī	*(')äy	*i*	*i*
*uH(_C-), *ū[2]	*ū	*äw	*u*	*u*
*o	*o	*æ	*a*	*e*
*eH(_C), *ē, *ei̯e	*ē	*'æ	*a*	*e*
*eu̯	*eu̯	*'äw	*u*	*u*
*ou̯	*ou̯	*æw	*o*	*ê̂ᵤ* (MQ), *au*
*ei̯	*ei̯	*'äy	*i*	*i*
*oi̯	*oi̯	*æy	*e*	*ey, ai*
*ēu̯	*ēu̯	*'æw	*o*	*ê̂ᵤ* (MQ), *au*
*ēi̯	*ēi̯	*'æy	*e*	*ey, ai*
*ōu̯	*ōu̯	*āw	*o*	*au*
*ōi̯	*ōi̯	*āy	*e*	*ai*

By setting up this list I do not want to imply that the respective PIE input always finally surfaces as the vowels indicated in the two rightmost columns. Quite to the contrary, various umlaut phenomena and processes of lengthening, strengthening, shortening, weakening, and deletion may have led to completely different results. All those special processes will be duly discussed whenever and wherever necessary.

In addition, pre-PT must already have had a non-palatalizing central vowel *ä, mostly because of a sound change PIE *CR̥C- > pre-

---

[2] This topic is controversial. The view given above is the one of Peters, 2006, 336, fn. 17 and 342; most scholars opt for different outcomes, most notably Hackstein, 1995, 23ff.

PT *CäRC-.[3] An epenthetic *ä was also realized after stem-final non-syllabics in front of verbal endings (e.g., in the Class III preterit), and in *CCC clusters such as *-kst- (and also, e.g., in the Class IX present). Finally, PIE schwa secundum also resulted in that *ä, to judge from *$k\ddot{a}tn\bar{a}$- = Gk. σκιδνα- from PIE *(s)k$_{\vartheta}$dn$_{e}$h$_{2}$-. Note that this pre-PT *ä was turned into (Late pre-PT or) Early PT *u after a labial non-syllabic (i.e., labiovelars, *p*, *m*, and *w*).

Even when functioning as the peak of a second syllable from the left or the initial syllable in a disyllabic form, where the vowel was expected to bear the accent according to the basic rule of TB accentuation, *ä resulting from both pre-PT *e and *ä was deleted in TB open syllables if followed by a dental (as established by Winter, 1993, 197ff. = 2005, 441ff.; but see already Normier, 1980, 276f.; Hilmarsson, 1991, 79f.), and also even in (some kinds of) closed syllables according to Klingenschmitt's rule (Klingenschmitt, 1994, 372 = 2005, 403, fn. 107), which claims that "ein *ä* in zweiter Wortsilbe zwischen Nasalen (und vielleicht allgemein zwischen gleichen oder ähnlichen Konsonanten) noch vor Aufkommen der westtocharischen Akzentregelung synkopiert wurde". In such cases, the accent was shifted onto the initial syllable. On the other hand, *(-)sk'äT- was even depalatalized whenever the *-ä- was the peak of a third or fourth syllable from the left (see the discussion in Hackstein, 1995, 206f.). Note further that pre-PT *#e- was turned into PT *yä- and pre-PT *#ē- into PT *yæ-; therefore, ^{AB}*yok*- 'drink' can be derived from pre-PT *#ēk^{ʷ}ä-. Another important PT sound law concerning both *ä from pre-PT *ä and *'ä from pre-PT *e was the regular metathesis *Cr(')/l(')äC- > *Cär/l(')C- (see, e.g., Ringe, 1996, 158f.). To judge from variants such as *śeruwe* 'hunter' and *ostuwa* 'houses', pre-PT developed its own kind of Sievers' Rule after pre-PT heavy syllables; but note that at the time of *o*-umlaut, those forms must have ended in *-äwV, and not in *-uwV (see also Malzahn, 2007, 241, fn. 15). Pre-PT must also have had a Lindeman rule of its own, as per Katz, 1997, 80.

In what follows, I will refer to all PT vowels and diphthongs that are not actually *(')ä, *(')äy, and *(')äw by the term "full vowels", and I will use the cover symbol "E" for them.

---

[3] Note that the following -*C*- might have also been a laryngeal. For #HR̥C- see Hackstein, 1998, 217ff.; however, I doubt that there is compelling evidence for any other result than PT *æRC-, which was also the regular outcome of PIE *R̥C-.

1.2.   The Essential Outcomes of the other PIE Non-Syllabics

As for the position in front of non-palatalizing vowels, we can safely assume the following results:

PIE	*p,	*t,	*k, k̂,	*d;	*m	*n	*r	*l	*(H)i̯	*(H)u̯	*s
	*b,	*dʰ,	*g,	*ti̯(#_V);					(#_V),	(#_V)	
	*bʰ	*dH	*ĝ,	*dʰi̯					*-di̯-		
			*gʰ,								
			*ĝʰ								
TA/TB	p	t	k	ts	m	n,	r	l	y	w	s
						ṅ					

In front of palatalizing vowels, however, we find rather the following outcomes:

	*t	*k	*ts	*n, *ṅ	*l	*w	*s
TA/TB	c	ś	TA ś	ñ	ly	TB y	ṣ

Accordingly, it seems that one cannot decide between setting up pre-PT *ä, *i, *u, and *e on the one hand, and reconstructing pre-PT *o and *ē on the other (at least as far as the phonological level alone is concerned) whenever TA/TB (*)ä and TB e(/ā) / TA a(/ā) are preceded by the result of a PIE labial stop, *m, *r, or *#(H)i̯ (but see the paragraph on palatalization in the next chapter). For palatalizing effects of pre-PT *i, see the discussion in Katz, 1995, 162f., fn. 30 and Malzahn, 2007, 241, fn. 15. Note that in the Class II preterits of Tocharian B, we find *py, *my, *tsy* rather than mere *p*, etc., and also *ky*, *ñy*, *wy*, *ṣpy*, rather than and beside *ś*, *ñ*, *y*, *ṣp*; see the detailed discussion in chap. Pt II. As for the results of PT *ts'-, Schulze, 1924, 168 = 1934, 241 was the first to notice that whereas examples for *ś-* < *ts'- from the verbal system abound in TA, there is just one single evident case of *ś-* < *ts'- to be found in TB, viz. the numeral *śak* '10' (for the evidence see now also, e.g., Ringe, 1996, 148). Since this distribution can hardly be due to mere chance, and since numerals are known to tend to behave irregularly (quite often more progressively than other parts of the lexicon) with respect to phonology, I conclude that the lautgesetzlich outcome of PT *ts'- was *ś-* in TA, and *ts-* in TB.

As for the vexed question of the lautgesetzlich results of the PIE labiovelars, see the work by Fellner, 2005 and 2006. There can be no doubt that the palatalized result of any labiovelar was *ś* as well. PIE *#dʰ- behaves in the same way as PIE *#d- whenever the respective root ended in another aspirate, which attests to a pre-PT variant of

Grassmann's Law, as first noticed by Werner Winter (see, e.g., the discussion in Ringe, 1996, 47). PIE *-bʰ- vanished without a trace at least in *keme*/ TA *kam* 'tooth' (see Ringe, 1996, 42f.). For irregular weakening of PT *-p- and *-m(-) see Peters, 2004, 430, 434, and Malzahn, 2007a, 270.

Intervocalically, PIE *i̯ seems to have been deleted exceedingly early, i.e., in pre-PT times, at least in a sequence PIE *ei̯e, and possibly also in a position between two low vowels, see the discussion in chap. Prs III/IV; in the very same position between two non-high vowels, the results of PIE *d and PIE *u̯ were deleted as well (see Ringe, 1996, 155ff.). For irregular strengthening of PT *(-)w- see Peters, 2004, 431f. In informal styles and in polysyllables, *-i̯- could be deleted quite early even after non-syllabics (witness *sana* < pre-PT *säni̯a < *sämi̯a < PIE *sm̥ih₂, and *-sa* in the fem. PPts < pre-PT *-si̯a < PIE *-sih₂). Whenever *-i̯- remained, *-ni̯- and *-li̯- resulted first in palatal geminates, but whereas the palatal character of *-n'n'- was mostly preserved into the historical times of TA and TB documents (see Hilmarsson, 1991a, 111ff.), the sequence *-l'l'- (like its Ancient Greek pendant) could have a twofold outcome: it either developed into *-ly-* or was depalatalized and thereby turned into TA/TB *-ll-* (see Hilmarsson, 1990, 101, 110 with ref.), and consequently fused with what was also the regular result of pre-PT *-l(C)n- (as per Ringe, 1996, 165). This (*)-*ll*- could further be simplified at least in pretonic position. For (*)-*ññ*- > -*ñ*- see Peters, 2006, 344f., and for the result of pre-PT *-si̯- with preserved *-i̯- see Peters, 2006, 343-345; for the development of pre-PT *Cu̯ clusters in general see Winter, 1972 = 1984, 205-211 = 2005, 157-162.

1.3. THE TOCHARIAN B ACCENT

In the standard variety of Tocharian B, the location of the accent can usually be seen thanks to the rendering of underlying /ä/ and /ā/. For several reasons it is quite obvious that /ä/ is rendered by ⟨ä⟩ if unaccented and rendered by ⟨a⟩ when bearing the accent, and in a quite parallel way /ā/ is rendered by ⟨ā⟩ when it bears the accent, and by ⟨a⟩ if devoid of accent. From the distribution of accent-bearing /ä/ and /ā/ one can then easily infer a basic rule of Tocharian B accentuation:
Disyllabic words usually bear the accent on the initial syllable, whereas polysyllabic words usually bear the accent on the second syllable from the left, cf. WTG, 10, § 5; TEB I, 43, § 10. We further find

word-final accentuation in what seem to be disyllabic forms which actually dropped final (*)-*ä* in standard Tocharian B.

In older manuscripts, notably those coming from the find spot of Ming-öi Qizil, /ä/ is rather generally rendered by ⟨ä⟩ even if accented, and /ā/ is rendered by both ⟨ā⟩ and ⟨a⟩ without correlation to the accent. This is actually one of the main characteristics of the more archaic, so-called MQ texts, as per WTG, 1ff., § 1; see now in detail Peyrot, 2008, 33ff. Peyrot, l.c., also shows that in these older texts ⟨ä⟩ and ⟨a⟩/⟨ā⟩ are *not* interchangeable inasmuch as ⟨ä⟩ never renders /ā/, but always stands for /ä/ (accented or unaccented).

On the other hand, we find consistent word-initial accentuation in a number of verbal categories, viz. in subjunctive forms of Classes I and V, and in the present, subjunctive, and preterit forms of kausativum paradigms (but note that members of these classes that are media tantum quite often are exceptions to the exception, i.e., follow the basic rule). As will be argued in detail in the respective chapters, it is quite often conceivable that the initial accent is due to the loss of an additional initial syllable. On the other hand, there exists/once must have existed a number of both nominal and verbal forms such as, e.g., *pátärä > *pātär*, *ǽnkäwæṣä > *eṅkoṣ* (as opposed to *lätáwæṣä > *ltuweṣ*) and *prǽkäwā > *prekwa* that could not have lost any additional first or second syllable, and nevertheless bear the accent on the initial syllable, a fact that, strangely enough, so far has hardly even been mentioned in the literature.[4] As for the forms that belong to the latter group, it strikes me that most of them have in common that the vowel of the initial syllable is a full vowel such as *ā* or *æ > TB *e*, and that the vowel of the following, second syllable is, or was, (*)*ä*. Furthermore, it is quite remarkable that with respect to the 1.sg. active forms of Class III preterits, which are expected to have ended in PT *-äwā, forms in -*Cwa* of the *prekwa* type abound, whereas all of the three forms in -*Cuwa* that I am aware of can be assigned to informal-style context. From this distribution I conclude that in the formal styles, forms of the shape (*)*(C)ECä...* originally bore the accent on the initial syllable quite regularly, whereas the informal styles had generalized the basic rule right from the start (*prækáwā, of course, should have resulted precisely in *prekuwa*). In historical times,

---

[4] A TB accentuation scheme different from the basic rule and applied to PT *æ ... ä sequences has, however, already been assumed by Ringe, 1989a, 37f., on the occasion, but also only for the purpose, of explaining certain PPts such as *yaitku*, *yairu*, etc.

however, it seems that the basic rule had already gained much new territory within the formal styles also, e.g., in the very paradigm of the Class III preterits, where forms of the *prekwa* type in the 1.sg. are regularly paired together with, e.g., 3.pl. forms of the *prekar* type, which must go back to *prækā́rä with accent on the second syllable. Note further that in Tocharian A, full vowels in an initial syllable never show weakening (see below 1.4.).

1.3.1. *The verbal accent in forms with attached clitic pronouns*

As to be expected with regard to the basic accent rule, the clitic variants of the personal pronouns, by forming an accentual unit with preceding verbal forms, cause underlying disyllabic finite verb forms of Tocharian B to shift the accent onto the second syllable from the left[5] (except when the latter belong to those marked categories with initial accent mentioned above).[6] As for the pronouns of the 3.sg. -*ne* and 1.–3.pl. -*me*, which always end in a surfacing vowel, cf., e.g., the 3.sg. Sub II *śman-me* (from *śämā́ṃ-me*) beside the (somewhat differently structured) 3.sg. *śanmäṃ* without clitic pronoun from the root *käm-* 'come', or the 3.sg. Prs II *cäñcan-me* from *cäṅk-* 'please'. Similarly structured subjunctive forms of Class I, however, have initial accent even if followed by such clitics, cf., e.g., the 3.sg. *tekäṃ-me* from *täk-* 'touch'. Middle forms in °-*(n/m)tär* are, of course, usually too long to be subject to such a shift, but the forms of the copula *ste* and *skente* if suffixed indeed turn into *star-* and *skentar-*. Interestingly enough, the (*)-*ä-* of the ending is syncopated in the 3.sg. *śem-neś* (attested beside *śema-ñ* and *śemo* < *śemä) of the thematic preterit of *käm-* 'come', either as a result of Klingenschmitt's rule (1994, 372 = 2005, 403, fn. 107) or as a reflex of the *pātär* rule discussed above. As for the clitic pronoun of the 1.sg. -*ñ* (< *-ñä), cf., e.g., the 3.sg. Prs I *nesa-ñ* from *nes-* be', the 3.sg. Prs VIII *pluṣa-ñ* from *plu-*, the 3.sg. Pt VI *śema-ñ* from *käm-* 'come', or the 3.sg. Sub V *śwā-ñ* from *śuwᵃ-* 'eat'. To my knowledge, no variants with *o* mobile are attested. As for -*ñä* in *wṣi-ñä* in the metrical passage S 4 b 3, I assume that the preservation of -*ä* is in all probability due to the following particle *nta*, because this is a text in standard Tocharian B and preservation of -*ä*

---

[5] At least from a descriptive point of view. W. Winter is of the opinion (p.c.) that clitics do not attract stress, but restore otherwise retracted stress.

[6] This means they do not attract word accent by themselves, as did, e.g., Latin -*que* in *itaque*, see Winter, 1993, 203 = 2005, 447.

instead of substitution by *o* mobile is unusual for such texts and what is more, neither *-ä* nor mobile *-o* should show up in the middle of a verse or colon at all (*o* mobile is usually confined to pāda/colon-final position). There are no probative examples to be found for the 2.sg. clitic pronoun *-c*,[7] which ended in (*)-*ä* as can be seen by attestations of preserved *-cä* or *-co* with *o* mobile. The 3.sg.act. *oräñ-c* from *ār⁽ä⁾-* Antigv. 'leave', on the other hand, has initial accent because of its status as a Sub I form.

1.4.   VOWEL BALANCE AND RELATED PHENOMENA IN TOCHARIAN A

Whereas the location of the accent in Tocharian B can be detected on the basis of the different renderings of /ä/ and /ā/, no such device is available for establishing the synchronic accent rules of Tocharian A. Consequently, there are different views on the synchronic accent of Tocharian A. However, most scholars work with the hypothesis that the accent rules of pre-Tocharian A at least were the same as the ones found valid for Tocharian B, i.e., that one can reconstruct the accent system of Proto-Tocharian on the basis of Tocharian B alone.

One thing that can be said about TA vowels in general is that there seems to be a manifest tendency to weaken or even delete vowels. On the one hand, *ä was generally deleted in open syllables, even if *ä functioned as the peak of an initial syllable in a PT disyllabic form (as, e.g., in TA *ysār* 'blood' from PT *yäsār). On the other hand, Late PT word-final vowels were generally deleted (except in PT mono-syllables; TA *śnu* 'wives' is maybe a reshaped *knu from PIE *gʷneh₂es). As a consequence, the active 1.sg. preterital ending TA *-ā* and the active 3.sg. ending of the imperfect and some kinds of preterits must be due to contraction of two vowels, or to some lengthening to compensate for the loss of a former additional syllable. In contrast, word-final vowels resulting from PT diphthongs having a full vowel as first element were preserved in Tocharian A.

Finally, Tocharian A was subject to a phenomenon usually referred to in English by the term "vowel balance" (based on the term "Vokalbalance" coined by the German manuals), or by "syncope" in the work of Werner Winter. This phenomenon consists of weakening of (*)-*ā*- to *-a-*, and weakening of (*)-*a*- (which may have resulted from (*)-*ā*- itself) to (*)-*ä*-, which then may even be deleted in an open

---

[7] Note that word-final *-c* can show up as *-ś* in the eastern and informal variants of Tocharian B, cf. Schmidt, 1986a, 642 and Peyrot, 2008, 77.

syllable.[8] In disyllabic forms of Tocharian A (which usually resulted from PT forms with an additional final syllable) with a full vowel in the initial syllable, PT (*)-*ā*-, if implementing the syllable peak of the second syllable, regularly turns into TA -*a*-, cf., e.g., the 3.pl. Pt I PT *tākāræ > TA *tākar*. In trisyllabic TA forms with a full vowel in the initial syllable and a full vowel in the third syllable, a PT (*)-*ā*-, *-*æ*-, *-*å*- implementing the syllable peak of the second syllable was weakened to (*)-*ä*-, which was finally deleted in an open syllable, cf., e.g., the Late PT obl.sg. *pæ/āykāntānä > TA *pekāntāṃ*, or the Late PT 1.sg.mid. Prs IV *årt(t)åmār > TA *artmār*. No such weakening occurs when the trisyllabic form had an *ä* in the initial syllable, cf. the PT 2.sg.mid. Pt I *kälpātāy > TA *kälpāte*. On the other hand, if the vowel of the initial syllable was a full vowel and the vowel of the third syllable an (*)-*ä*-, a PT *-*ā*- implementing the peak of the second syllable was again weakened to TA -*a*-, and this -*a*- remained unchanged like any other TA -*a*- found in this position, cf., e.g., the Late PT 1.pl.mid. Pt I *pæ/āykāmätæ > TA *pekamät*, the Late PT 3.sg.mid. Prs IV *yåtåtär > TA *yatatär*, or the Late PT 1.pl. Prs I/II *næsæmäsä > TA *nasamäs*. In forms consisting of (at least) four syllables of the structures *(C)EC(C)E(C)Cä(C)CE- or *(C)EC(C)EC(C)āCV-, an (*)-*ā*- in the second or third syllable respectively was also weakened to TA (*)-*ä*-, and was finally deleted in an open syllable. This is of relevance for the verbal abstracts in TA -*lune* from PT *-āl-, and for the preterit participles in PT *-āw- such as Late PT *pāpāykāw- as well (cf. TA *peklune*, TA *pāpeku*). Preterit participles of the type TA *kakmu* most probably also show weakening and loss of a full vowel (in this case, PT *-æ-) that once stood in the second syllable, to judge from the equivalent forms of Tocharian B on the one hand, and the type TA *nānku* < *nānākäw- on the other hand. For vowel balance in general see TEB I, 45ff., § 11. As for forms that seem to violate the principles of vowel balance, most of those apparent exceptions can be neatly explained by assuming a PT proto-form with an additional non-final syllable that was eventually lost in Tocharian A, see above all Winter, 1994, 401ff. = 2005, 450ff. Obvious examples of this kind are, e.g., the 1.sg. Pt I TA *tākā* from PT *tākāwā and the 3.sg.mid. Pt III TA *eṃtsāt* from Late PT *æṇkäsātæ. See also

---

[8] A relic form showing weakening of *-*ā*- to -*ä*- and yet preservation of that vowel in an open syllable is the *m*-Part TA *kropnämāṃ*, a variant of the regular TA *kropnmāṃ* from ᴬ*krop*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'gather' attested once in a metrical passage.

Klingenschmitt, 1994, 314 = 2005, 356, fn. 6 on TA *polkāṃts* 'star or lightning' < *på-läkāntsā. On the other hand, TA *-ant-* instead of expected **-änt-* in a lot of participial forms can be explained by analogical levelling, see chap. Prs Part. As for the treatment of PT full-vowel diphthongs in the context of TA vowel balance (e.g., TA *kaklyuṣu* with *-u-* vs. TA *pāpeku* with *-e-* instead of **-i-*), see Peters 2006, 333, fn. 14 with ref. Since in the context of vowel balance a full vowel never undergoes any kind of weakening in an initial syllable, it is rather safe to assume that in Tocharian A full vowels implementing the peak of an initial syllable in a word bore the accent.

1.5.   *ā*-UMLAUT

The Tocharian *ā*-umlaut was detected by Winter, 1962a, 32f. = 1984, 274 = 2005, 62f. By this umlaut a PT *æ is turned into TA/TB (*)*ā* when a PT *ā implemented the peak of the following syllable.[9] It was treated in greater detail by Cowgill, 1967, 171ff.= 2006, 445ff., who was the first to notice that *ā*-umlaut behaved like a sound law and was observed in all contexts in Tocharian B, whereas in Tocharian A *ā*-umlaut failed to occur in quite a lot of forms. In order to explain this discrepancy, by assuming that pre-Tocharian A may have had the very same accentuation rules as historical Tocharian B, Cowgill claimed that in pre-TA *ā*-umlaut took place only in forms in which the syllable with the *ā to trigger *ā*-umlaut bore the accent. Adams, 1978a, 449 basically subscribed to Cowgill's conditioning, and further suggested as an amendment that any PT *æ-vowel resulting from pre-PT *ē was affected by *ā*-umlaut regardless of the further context, and was thereby able to explain the TA imperfect forms of the type *lyāk* as regular outcomes of PT *l'ǽkā with unaccented **-ā(-)*. Unfortunately, Cowgill's rule still makes a lot of wrong predictions, even if one were willing to accept Adams' amendment: on the one hand, *ā*-umlaut occurred neither in PT *prætsākå (cf. TB *pratsāko*/ TA *pratsak* 'breast') nor in PT *sælātæ (cf. TA *salat* 'flying (animal)'), nor in all the active 3.pl. Pt I forms of the type TA *plawar* (from PT **-æCāræ*); on the other hand, *ā*-umlaut also occurred in quite a lot of members of the one Pt I

---

[9] Kümmel, 2009, 172ff. sets up a similar umlaut for PT *å by which a sequence PT *å ... ā should turn to *ā ... ā (which he claims have "far-reaching consequence for historical grammar"); however, there is only counterevidence against and no good evidence in favor of such an umlaut rule.

subclass that constantly shows a non-palatalizing surface root vowel -*ā*-, such as TA *spārttu* 'turned'.[10]

Since *ā*-umlaut is essentially a kind of vowel assimilation, which typologically often occurs only sporadically, one may toy with the idea that it may not have behaved like a sound law at all, so that no further conditioning of *ā*-umlaut could be detected at all. This said, it seems to me that in Tocharian A *ā*-umlaut always occurred both in PT disyllabic forms (such as **l'ækā*, **spærtwā*) and in PT trisyllabic forms of the structure **(C)æC(C)āC(C)ā* (such as **l'ækāwā*, **l'ækāstā*, **æknātsā*); therefore, one may conclude that *ā*-umlaut in pre-Tocharian A had occurred by sound law precisely in these two contexts only. The plural forms of the active and middle paradigms and any 3.sg. form in a middle paradigm of the imperfect type **l'ækā* and of the Class I preterits of the type **spærtwā* would then have to have their *ā*-vowels by paradigmatic leveling, and PPts of both the type TA *pāpeku* and the type TA *nānku* would have to owe their TA -*ā*- to analogical processes as well. There exist even some irregular forms such as the PPt TA *kākrupu* (attested beside TA *kākropu*, which shows an *o* parallel to the *e* of the TA *pāpeku* type) from *^A krop^(a)*- 'gather' which may lend support to such a view.

1.6.   Umlaut Leading to TA/TB *o*

PT **æ* was turned into TA/TB *o* by two different kinds of umlaut that are usually called *o*-umlaut and *u*-umlaut:

On the one hand, PT **æ* became TA/TB *o* in forms in which the following syllable contained PT **å* (see, above all, Adams, 1978a, 449; Hilmarsson, 1984, 143; 1986, 29ff.; Pinault, 1987a, 89ff.; Ringe, 1996, 163, §67). Similarly, Early PT **äw* from pre-PT **ŭ* and **eṷ(_C)* turned to TA/TB *o* in the same context (as per Hilmarsson, 1986, 38-42). This kind of umlaut had little impact on verbal morphology with the exception of *sosoyu* from **sæså̊y*-. On the other hand, the *u*-umlaut that turned PT **æ* into TA/TB *o* before a pre-PT and even Early PT **u* in the following syllable is highly relevant for the verbal system,

---

[10] Ringe, 1987a, 262 on the one hand follows Cowgill by assuming that *ā*-umlaut in TA "affected only unstressed" PT **æ*, but then on the other hand concludes that TA *pratsak*, which did not undergo *ā*-umlaut, "was accented on its initial syllable when a-umlaut occurred". This would imply, of course, that pre-TA did not have the same accentuation rules as historical TB, in striking contrast to the basic assumption made by Cowgill.

because it possibly also worked with an Early PT *u that I think may have developed from a pre-PT *ä immediately after a labial stop, labiovelar, *m, and *u̯. By this umlaut rule one may derive ᴬᴮ*yok*- 'drink', the Sub I *yonm-*/ ᴬ*yom*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'reach', the Sub I *yop*- and the TA Pt III *yow*- 'enter' from pre-PT *ēk̯ʰ+C-, *i̯om+C- (or *ēm+C-?), *i̯op+C- via *ēk̯ʰäC- etc. > Early PT *yækuC- etc. > *yokuC- etc. > Late PT *yokäC-,[11] etc. This kind of umlaut could enable us to tell when a reduplicated PPt from a root with initial pre-PT *u̯- was formed from the zero grade of the root and when it was formed from a full grade, because zero-grade allomorph PT *wæwäC- should have first become *wæwuC-, then *wowuC-, and eventually by sound law TA *woC*- (and TB (*)*oC*-), whereas full-grade allomorphs *wæwæC- and *w'æw'äC- should, of course, not be affected by *u*-umlaut, and accordingly turn into TA *waC*- (and TB *weC*- and *yeC*-, respectively; as for the actually attested forms of Tocharian B such as *ausu*, which point to a former analogical preservation or rather reintroduction of the second syllable, see Ringe, 1989a, 35ff.).[12]

---

[11] Note the remarkable absence of umlaut in *wek* / TA *wak* 'voice, noise' (suggesting that pre-PT *-u̯ok̯ʰä- had turned to *-u̯okä- by dissimilation). At a first glance, Jasanoff, 1992, 151, fn. 28 (*yokäṃ* "the lineal continuant of ... *h₁ég̯ʰ-ti") and Weiss, 1994, 92, fn. 5 seem to follow the same strategy, but to judge from Jasanoff, 1978, 32, § 25, the Jasanoff school rather thinks that pre-PT *ē, and only pre-PT *ē but not also pre-PT *o, was rounded "before a labial or labialized consonant" (scil. one standing in syllable-final position), thereby following a suggestion of Jochem Schindler (cf. ibidem fn. 16: "The suggestion that these roots originally contained a long vowel is due to Schindler", and note also Cowgill, 1967, 173 = 2006, 446: "In *yäp*- 'enter', *yänm*- 'attain', and *wätk*- 'separate, decide' the adjacent labial has umlauted *æ to *o: *yopäṃ*, *yonmäṃ*, *wotkäṃ* ... *kewu* may have restored *e* analogically on account of *kowu** 'I will kill'"). However, also pre-PT *o must actually have been involved in Schindler's rule, to judge from TB *sompastär* 'deprives', and since one has to reconstruct pre-PT *ä-vowels in front of verbal endings anyway, it is neither necessary nor economical to set up such a special rounding rule (to judge from *ṣñor* 'sinew' < PT *sn'æwur, Sub I forms such as *kewu*, *rewät* must indeed be analogical innovations, as already seen by Cowgill).

[12] Note, however, that in forms built from a root of the type *wäT*- such as *wät*-, TA *woT*- (as in 3.pl.act. Pt II TA *wotār*) may just be the result of pre-TA *wawT- from older pre-TA *wa-wäT- (from PT *w'æw'äT- or *wæwæT-) with analogically preserved, or reintroduced, root syllable. To be completely honest, we never can totally exclude that (pre-)TB *wo- and TA *wo*- are rather contraction products of a very archaic reduplicated structure PT *w(')äw(')æ- with the original reduplication vowel *(')ä still preserved, and not replaced by *æ.

As for yet another kind of *o*-umlaut yielding TB *o*/ TA *a* that affected pre-PT *a and Late PT *ā rather than preserved PT *æ, and which is of crucial importance for the diachronic analysis of present Classes III and IV, see the respective chapter on these present classes.

1.7.   FURTHER ASPECTS OF PALATALIZATION

From what was written above one may guess that the results of pre-PT *teC- etc. and pre-PT *täC- etc. were kept constantly distinct, viz. the first yielding palatalized TA/TB (*)*cäC-* etc. and the second TA/TB (*)*täC-* etc., whereas sequences involving consonants without palatalized counterpart such as pre-PT *peC-/*meC- and pre-PT *päC-/*mäC- merged completely, both resulting in TA/TB (*)*päC-*/ (*)*mäC-*. Quite to the contrary, however, there is now a widespread belief that only pre-PT *päC-/*mäC- turned out as TA/TB (*)*päC-*/ (*)*mäC-*, and that pre-PT *peC-/*meC- regularly resulted in TB *piC-* and *miC-*, even where the immediately following non-syllabic -*C-* did not have a palatal quality itself; see, e.g., Adams 1978a, 448, fn. 9 ("PTch *i̯ä appears as -*i-* (usually) in B and -*ä-* in A", mentioning *mit* 'honey' and °*pirko*/ TA °*pärk* 'rising (of the sun)' to be derived from "PTch *pi̯ärkō̆"); Katz, 1995, 162, fn. 30 (who is, however, rather skeptical himself); Ringe, 1996, 102, 105, 141; Winter, 1999, 270 (who nevertheless concedes that *pareṃ* 'they carry' could go back to PIE *bʰeront by sound law, evidently because of the following back vowel *-o-). In favor of such a view one can put forth *piś* 'five' that clearly goes back to PIE *penkʷe (although it must be borne in mind that numerals quite often show irregular developments), and the synchronic *i*/*ä*-ablaut met in the 3.pl.act. *pirsāre* vs. 3.sg.med. *pärsāte* (from *pärsᵃ-* 'sprinkle') that is best explained in terms of a pre-PT *e/ä-ablaut (on which see chap. Pt I). In terms of phonology, PT *p'äC- > TB *piC-* also seems quite plausible, because in the informal and in the eastern varieties of Tocharian B a PT *-ä- could turn into -*i-* in any kind of palatal environment (see TEB I, 49, § 15,1b; Stumpf, 1990, 68ff., and most recently Peyrot, 2008, 55ff.). Unfortunately, at closer inspection things do not look so simple. First, there seem to be counterexamples such as the thematic stem *pär-* 'carry, etc.', evidently from PIE *bʰer-e/o-. According to Ringe, 1996, 105, -*ä-* is to be explained as the result of a morphologically conditioned depalatalization process (for which there is little other evidence, see Kim, 2006, 133f., and chap.s Sub II and Prs II), whereas Winter, 1999, 270 preferred to derive *pär-* from a zero grade of the root. But in that

case one could hardly explain why *pi-* is also met in *kauṃ-pirko* (/ eastern *kom-pirko* 108 b 5) 'sunrise' (see the attestations in Winter, 1988, 777 = 2005, 331) and *pilko* 'gaze', which both belong to the numerous abstracts in *-o* otherwise clearly based on active preterit I stems, notwithstanding the fact that the active 3.sg. forms of the Pt I paradigms of the respective roots for 'rise' and 'look at' are *parka* and *palyka*, respectively, that is, with surface *-a-* from (*)-*ä-* rather than with *-i-*. If *-i-* in these abstracts indeed points to proto-forms with pre-PT *e, then *parka* and *palyka* are most likely to be derived from full-grade forms as well (as per Klingenschmitt, 1982, 108f.; 1994, 314 = 2005, 356, fn. 6: "*parka* ... < vorurtoch. *$b^her\hat{g}^h$-ə-t*").[13] Even more obviously, both attested allomorphs *-ṣpirtt-* and *ṣparttaṣṣ-* from *spārtt*[(ä)]- 'turn, behave, be' must go back to the same preform PT *sp'ärt°. The preliminary conclusion then will be that for yet unknown reasons, PT *(s)p'äC- could result in both TB *(ṣ)piC-* and TB (*)*(ṣ)päC-*. In addition, we find the opposite distribution of *i* and *ä* in the pair *pältakw*/ TA *piltäk* 'drop, dew', so that we are further led to conclude that PT *p'äC- could yield both results *päC-* and *piC-* in Tocharian A as well. Second, in some cases TB *-i-* seems to result from a pre-PT vowel *ä in a completely non-palatalizing context, i.e., in *wīna* 'pleasure' and in the 3.pl. Pt I *witāre* and 3.sg. Prs *witär* (both from *wät*[ä?]- 'fight'), because pre-PT *u̯eC- was, of course, expected to result in TB *yäC-. Third, with respect to *pilko* and *palyka*, the paradigm of the Pt I of the respective root has the following forms in standard Tocharian B: 3.sg.act. *palyka*, 3.pl.act. *pälykāre*,[14] 3.sg.med. *pälkāte*. Hence, in this paradigm we find a consonantal variation *-lyk-/-lk-* rather than a synchronic ablaut *-i-/-ä-*. Nevertheless, precisely this variation is again best taken to reflect a former pre-PT ablaut *e/ä.[15] From this we clearly have to infer once more that PT *p'äC- could turn

---

[13] Note further that *pīlto* 'leaf' (for the *-o* see Schmidt, 1982, 363) is, according to Adams, DoT, 388 to be derived from a zero-grade proto-form *$b^h\b{l}H$-t- (any full-grade variant from a root ending in a laryngeal is indeed expected to have yielded a different result). However, cognate OHG *blat*, etc. cannot be taken to be the lautgesetzlich outcome of a full-grade or zero-grade proto-form derived from a root with a final laryngeal either.

[14] There also exists an eastern variant 3.pl.act. *pilykār*.

[15] TB *-lyk-* is also met constantly in the Pt III of the antigrundverb of *pälk*[(ä)]- 'burn, torment' (3.sg.act. *pelyksa*, 2.sg.med. *palyksatai*, PPt *pepalykusai, pepälykoṣ*). Since a pre-PT ablaut *o vs. *ä would not account for the *-lyk-*, one may think of a pre-PT Narten ablaut *ē vs. *e.

out as both standard TB *piC-* and standard TB *päC-*.[16] With respect to the palatalized *-ly-* that only shows up after pre-PT **e* and is otherwise absent in *pilko, pīlto,* and *pīle* 'wound', one could speculate that two specific alternative outcomes of PT **p'äl-* existed in standard Tocharian B, on the one hand *pil-,* and on the other hand (*)*päly-*.

Forms reminiscent of TB (*)*pälyk-,* i.e., with a palatal *ly* in front of an otherwise non-palatalizing **ä* or with root-final clusters of the structure **-C$_1$'C$_2$-* in front of any kind of vowels, are rather frequently met in Tocharian A. Note above all the following Pt III forms:
TA *palyäṣt* from *^{A}päl$^{(ä)}$-* Antigv. 'extinguish'; TA *pyockäs* from *^{A}pyutk-* 'come into being'; TA *plyocksā-m* from *^{A}plutk-* '± arise'; TA *lyockwā* from *^{A}lutk$^{(ä)?}$-* 'make, turn into'; TA *wackwā* from *^{A}wätk$^{(ä)}$-* Antigv. 'separate' (note that the PPt had non-palatalized *-tk-,* to judge from TA *watkuräṣ*). At least in both TA *plyock-* and TA *lyock-,* the old root-initial palatalization is preserved. At the same time, the root-initial palatalization must also have been shifted onto the **t* that followed later in the form, i.e., PT **(p)l'æwtk-* > pre-TA **(p)l'æwt'k-*.[17] There

---

[16] It must be admitted that it is rather customary to assume for (*)*pälyk-* a liquid metathesis **pl^{y}äkā-* > **päl^{y}kā-* (in the notation of the recent statement by Kim, 2004, 209, fn. 39), on the basis of evidence such as Greek φλέγω. However, *pilko, pelyksa,* and maybe also the Sub V *pālkau* rather point to a schwebeablaut occurring in the Tocharian preterital stem, i.e., pre-PT **bʰelg-* and **bʰēlg-* contrasting with the PIE **bʰleg-* found in the Greek present. On such a schwebeablaut opposition between present and aorist stems see, e.g., Peters, 1975, 41. Hackstein, 1995, 114, fn. 20 rather assumes analogy in the case of *pelykwa,* but note that we also have a form like *plyāwa* next to *pepälyworsa.*

[17] One can also compare *ṣalype/* TA *ṣälyp* 'ointment' (differently Klingenschmitt, 1975, 153 = 2005, 137, fn. 7; Ringe, 1996, 114). As for TA *wackwā,* TB responds with *otkasa,* from **wäwætk-* without a palatalized root initial, according to Peters, forthc.; the PPt stem TA *watk-,* on the other hand, can easily be derived from **wæwætk-,* so one may doubt that TA *wack-* is to be derived directly from a palatalized **w'äw(')æt'k-* < **w'äwætk-*. I assume that a preform with such a lautgesetzlich outcome of a reduplicated structure may have been immediately turned into **wäwætk-*. Pace Hilmarsson, 1990, 110 and 112, I do not think that PIE reduplicated presents **si-sl̥-i̯e/o-* and **se-sol-* could have turned into PT **ṣäsälyyä-* and **ṣäsæl-* with preserved word-initial **ṣ-,* which are meant to explain the Sub II of the antigrundverb of *säl$^{(ä)}$-* 'fly' *ṣällatsi* and related Pt I *ṣälla,* respectively (for another explanation of these forms, see s.v. *säl$^{(ä)}$-* 'fly', and Malzahn, in print a). Maybe it is best to assume that in the active pre-TA Pt III paradigm of the root, irregular **wäwætk-* was replaced with synchronically regular **w'ætk-,* which later on

exists yet another form of Tocharian A which clearly shows that bare metathesis of palatalization could occur in this branch of Tocharian as well, i.e., a shift or transfer of the original word-initial palatalization to the right without preservation of the palatalization at the beginning of the word: from the grundverb of the root *Akätk^(a)-* 'cross, pass', we actually find two different active 3.sg. forms of the preterit I, on the one hand TA *śtäk*, which looks like the perfectly regular result of a regular proto-form *k'ätkā, and on the other hand TA *kcäk*, evidently from *kät'kā, which can be explained as an outcome of the aforementioned *k'ätkā by mere metathesis of palatalization.[18] Such a metathesis of palatalization could occur as well within clusters consisting of two consonants. A development *-tk'- > *-t'k- can be observed in the TA Prs II forms 2.pl.act. TA *kāckäc* and Ger I TA *kāckäl* from *Akätk-* 'rejoice, be glad' (whereas *-tk'- yielded *-cc-* in related TB *kācc-*).[19] A development *st'- > *s't- is met in the TB archaic-looking, irregular oppositional transitive 1.sg.act. Pt I *ṣṭamāwa* from *stäm^(a)-* 'stand' (whereas in the regular Pt II we find both *śäm-* and

---

may have turned either into *w'æt'k- or just into *wæt'k- (see immediately below); participial TA *watk-* then may rather come from pre-TA *w'æw'ätk-.

[18] See also Pinault, 2006, 106f., who prefers to explain the palatalization analogically. In my opinion, the case of TA *kcäk/śtäk* militates against the claim by Ringe, 1996, 142 that the root-final palatalization found in TA forms such as *pyockäs*, *plyockäs*, and *lyockäs* first occurred just in TA *s*-preterits where the "initial consonants could no longer be distinctively palatalized" (that is, in forms such as pre-TA *w'ætk-, but not in forms such as pre-TA *(p)l'æwtk-, which according to Ringe had adopted the *-ck-* cluster very recently and secondarily), and had started out precisely as a device for making up for the lautgesetzlich loss of word-initial palatalization that had to affect initials such as *p'-, *py'-, and *w'- (but, of course, not *k'-). On the other hand, a shift of palatalization from the right to the left may best explain the aforementioned Sub II of the antigrundverb of *säl^(a)-* 'fly' *ṣällatsi* and related Pt I *ṣälla*, see Malzahn, in print a. Finally, PT *wä- could turn into pre-TB *w'ä- > *yä- where a sequence *-'äyæ followed later in the word, as is shown by the joint evidence of both *yṣīye* 'night', which must go back to PT *wäs'æy < *wus'æy < *wäs'æy on the evidence of TA *oṣeṃ* and *oṣeñi* 'at night' from PT *æwus'æy°, and also *yrīye* 'male sheep' from PT *wär'æy- based on a PIE hysterokinetically inflected *u̯r̥h₁én- (see also Peters, 2004, 434f., fn. 28 with an alternative solution).

[19] As for the remarkable fact that in TA roots in *-tk* it is merely the *t* that gets palatalized, Koller, 2008, 25ff. argues that this is due to the phonological template Tocharian A assigned to its roots, TA *-k* being phonologically treated as a root extension and not as part of the root.

ścām-); finally, *tr'*- regularly resulted in TB/TA *tr-*, though occasionally also in TA *cr-*, which may be also taken as a result of such a metathesis, i.e., of *tr'*- > *t'r-*. If such metatheses of palatalization did indeed take place, one may explain the presence of *wi-* in TB forms such as *wīna* and *witär* by assuming that we are facing pre-PT full-grade forms with a pre-PT root vowel *e, and that PT *w'änā and *w'ätär underwent a metathesis of palatalization of the type *C'VC > *CVyC, thereby turning into *wäynā and *wäytär. Furthermore, one may venture the idea that by a metathesis of almost the same kind, *-l'CāC- yielded -lCāyC- in the otherwise enigmatic privative formation TB *empalkaitte*.[20] As a consequence, one may then finally guess that the lautgesetzlich result of *p'äC- and *m'äC- sequences was precisely TB/TA *päC-* and TB/TA *mäC-*, viz. in cases where neither shift nor metathesis of palatalization occurred. On the other hand, *piC-* and *miC-* may always be the outcome of *päyC- and *mäyC- sequences. These may have resulted from metatheses of the *C'äC- > *CäyC- kind as attested by TB *wīna* and *witär*.[21] The allomorph (*)*päly(k)-* can be taken as the result of either *p'äl'(k)- with shift and preservation of the palatalization at the same time (as in TA (*p)lyock-*), or of *päl'(k)- with shift/transfer only, i.e., with bare metathesis of palatalization (as in TA *kcäk*).[22] In Tocharian B, *ts'äC-

---

[20] There can be no doubt that a metathesis of such a kind has to be assumed for the TA 'Prs III' stem allomorph TA *kare-* 'laugh', clearly from *kær(ä)yæ- (← *kær'æ- < *pre-PT *Korei̯e/o-) still preserved in the TA Sub V 3.sg.act. *karyaṣ*, as per Jasanoff, 1978, 46.

[21] As for °*pirko* and *pīlto*, I would not rule out the possibility that in the ancestors of these two forms *pä- was changed into *p'ä- by hypercorrection. I think there are at least two forms of Tocharian B with word-initial *y-* instead of expected *w-* that may indeed be best explained as reflexes of proto-forms with a hypercorrect *w'-, i.e., *ylaiñäkte* 'Indra' (differently on this form Peters, 2004a, 267, fn. 5), and *yerkwanto* 'wheel' (both morphological considerations and the combined evidence of the TA equivalent *wärkänt* and related TB *orkäntai* 'back and forth, to and fro' from PT *æwurkänt- < *ænwärk(w)änt- clearly militate in favor of a pre-PT *i̯ärk(u̯)äntō(s), which implies that the TB root vowel -*e*- and maybe even the -*w*- should be explained in terms of hypercorrection as well).

[22] As for Pt I *piñña* vs. *pännāte* from *pänn*ᵃ- 'stretch', which show the very same *i/ä*-ablaut that we meet in *pirsāre* vs. *pärsāte*, it must be borne in mind that there must have existed a pre-PT present stem *ponHu̯ei̯e/o- > PT *pænw'æ-/*pænw'yæ-, which could have helped to turn *-nwā into *-nw'ā > pre-TB *-n(')yā > -*ñña*, or could even have triggered such a change alone

evidently behaved exactly like *p'äC- and *m'äC-: on the one hand, there is Pt-II-related *tsetstsarormeṃ* with *-tsar-* most probably from PT *-ts'är-. On the other hand, *tsiC-* is found in both the 2.sg.med. Ipv III *pätsilpar-ñ* and in *tsirauñe* 'strength' (see Ringe, 1996, 148). Note that such shifts and metatheses quite often occur only sporadically and do not behave like sound laws, see, e.g., Peters, 1980, 316f., fn. 262 on shifts and metatheses of aspiration in Ancient Greek.

1.8.   GEMINATION

In both Tocharian A and B, we sometimes find examples of etymologically unexpected consonant gemination, most of which are found at very strong boundaries.

1.8.1.   *Word-internal gemination at strong morpheme boundaries*

Word-internal gemination of a root-initial consonant is notably attested in reduplicated preterit participles after the reduplication vowel, in imperative forms after the imperative particle, and in compounds. The root *tätt^a-* 'put' is certainly a fossilized example of that very phenomenon: PT *tätā- < PIE *dʰi/e-dʰ(o)- (on the etymology see Hackstein, 1995, 63, fn. 57, and Adams, DoT, 284).

1.8.1.1.   *The preterit participle*

Gemination of a root-initial consonant after the reduplication syllable is not so rare a phenomenon in the PPts of Tocharian A and B, but different preterit classes show different behavior. Gemination is rather regularly attested in PPts based on a kausativum preterit stem of Class II for initial *c*, *ś*, *ṣ*, and *ts* in TB (e.g., *śeśśarsoṣ* from *kärs^(a)-* Kaus. IV 'make know(n)', *tsetstsarormeṃ* from *tsär^(a)-* Kaus. I 'separate'). Most instances of geminated PPts outside Pt II concern forms from roots with initial *k°* like: *kakkāccu* and *kakkācoṣ* from *kātk-* 'rejoice' attested beside *kakāccu* even in the same text (107); PPt *kakkārpau* from *karp^(a)-* 'descend' (THT 1680 b 1); PPt *kekkärku* (MQ) from *kärk-* 'bind'; PPt *kakkraupau* from *kraup^(a)-* 'gather' (THT 1362 a 1). Gemination also shows up in derived absolutives like *kakkārparmeṃ* from *kārp^(a)-* 'descend' attested in THT 1327 (= TX 6) b 4, and also in

---

(which then would have been a purely analogical change, and would not have presupposed an original initial *p'ä-).

kakkārpäṣṣormeṃ from the kausativum of the same root. Gemination is less often found in PPts from roots beginning with *t°* (*tettinor* from *tin^ä-* '± defile oneself').

In Tocharian A, gemination of this kind is far less frequent than in Tocharian B, but at least gemination in front of a sonorant is attested by TA *caccrīku* from the Pt II of *^Atrik^(ä)-* Kaus. II 'sin against' and TA *kākkñäññu* from *^Akñā-ññ-* '± recognize'.

1.8.1.2.   *The imperative*

In the imperative, the root-initial consonant can be geminated after the imperative particle. TEB I, 234, § 422,3 called this phenomenon "Verschärfung des Wurzelanlauts". Just as in the PPt, from forms belonging to classes other than Class II we have examples with root-initial *k°* and *t°*, but then in addition also one with *r°*:

2.sg. Ipv *pokkāka*, 2.pl. Ipv *pokkākas* from *kāk^ä-* 'call' (all instances in TB showing the geminate; but cf. the non-geminated 2.pl.act. Ipv TA *p˯kāks-äṃ* from *^Akāk^ä-* 'call'); 2.pl.mid. Ipv *pättāsat* 'put!' from *tās-* 'put', similarly TA 2.sg.mid. Ipv *pätstsār*, and 2.pl.mid. Ipv TA *pätstsāc* (both forms are only attested with geminates); 2.sg.mid. Ipv *pärrittar* 'persist!' from *ritt^(ä)-* 'be attached'. This kind of gemination is attested in texts of all kinds and provenances.

In some of the imperatives of Class II, which all belong to a kausativum paradigm and which are usually associated with a preterit of Class II, we also find gemination. Actually, initial *c°* here turns into *-cc-* even more consistently than in the PPt: 2.sg.act. Ipv *päccauk* from *tuk-* Kaus. I 'hide', 2.sg.act. Ipv *päccapa* from *täp-* 'proclaim'.

From a diachronic point of view, the isolated 2.sg. Ipv *pete* shows the same phenomenon, according to Peters, 2004, 431, fn. 12, who claims *pete* is to be derived directly from pre-PT *po do (following the analysis by Hackstein, 2001, 17ff., who, however, reckoned with an analogical reshaping of †*petse*) via geminated *po ddo.

1.8.1.3.   *Compounds*

Klingenschmitt, 1994, 374 = 2005, 405 fn. 109 has a short list of forms showing gemination of initial consonants of second members of compounds, such as, e.g., *wi-ppewänne* 'having two feet' attested in PK AS 16.2 a 1 (Pinault, 1989a, 154). Judging from that list one may come to the conclusion that such gemination is mainly found in eastern texts (cf. *ñikte-ññikte* from 108 (S) and *se ññisa* from 107 (S), to

which Klingenschmitt refers as kind of a parallel). However, gemination in compounds is also attested in normal, non-informal style texts of non-eastern provenance, so that we cannot simply be dealing with an eastern, informal-style phenomenon.[23]

1.8.1.4. *Diachrony*

Although we seem to deal with spontaneous gemination at first glance, efforts can be made, and indeed have been already made, to provide at least a part of these cases with a diachronic explanation. Schulze, 1924, 173 = Schulze, 1934, 247 has been the first to claim that the PPts of Tocharian go back to proto-forms with double reduplication such as "papapyutku", but I do not think that this is a good idea even for the PPts that belong to Class II preterits, see chap PPt 14.2.2. As for the imperative forms, assuming the former presence of a reduplication syllable would often make excellent sense morphologically, but not phonologically, since a proto-form pre-TB *päcäcäpä with preserved *-cäcä- was expected to result either in standard TB *pcacpa or (via Klingenschmitt's rule) *pac(c)pa, but not in the actually attested *päccapa*. Note that diachronically, sequences consisting of a non-lexical particle PT *pæ/*pä and a lexical verbal form could, and even should, be subsumed under the cases discussed below sub 1.8.2. As for the compounds, some examples such as *tsamo-ppilene* 'abscess or tumor wound' may show a geminate that had resulted regularly from a former sequence pre-PT *-s+C-, see the strategy followed by Klingenschmitt, 1994, 349 = 2005, 385 and similar cases of gemination in compounds found in Greek; but of course one would not like to explain the case of the compounds differently from the case of the PPts, for which see chap. PPt 14.2.2.

1.8.2. *Gemination at word boundaries*

Gemination of word-initial consonants or word-final consonants is often attested with preceding and following non-lexical words, cf. the list in TEB I, 74, § 63f. In Tocharian A, this kind of sandhi phenomenon seems attested more often than in Tocharian B. Again, this kind of gemination is attested in texts of all variants and provenances of Tocharian B. Here, it is found above all after the negation *mā*, cf., e.g., *mā ttsa*, *mā kkrāke* (334 b 9); the adverb *snai*, cf., e.g., *snai kkarūṃ*; the

---

[23] To be sure, Klingenschmitt did not make such a claim.

relative pronoun *k͡uce*, cf., e.g., *k͡uce ṣṣap*, or *se ññisa*;[24] the adverb/adjective *po* 'all', cf., e.g., *po lläklenta*; the conjunction *entwe*, cf., e.g., *entwe kka*. Note especially the postposition *päst* that itself ends in a consonant cluster and nevertheless can cause gemination of a following word initial, cf., e.g., *päst ññaṣṣi*. On the other hand, a non-lexical word itself can also show gemination of its own final consonant, cf., e.g., *ñiśś erkatte* or *alekk ra* (cf. TEB I, 74, § 63), and in addition show gemination of its own initial consonant even after lexical words, cf., e.g., *weñenta ccemts* or *yatwesa ṣṣek* (cf. TEB I, 74, § 64). A similar case may be the gemination of the initial of an enclitic pronoun following a verbal form such as *kanaṣäm-nne*.

As for Tocharian A, the postposition TA *mosam* can cause gemination of the word-final consonant of a preceding lexical word, cf., e.g., TA *ākāliss mosam* (cf. TEB I, 74, § 63). Moreover, gemination at a word boundary can even be found in cases where two lexical words are involved, cf. TA *pältsäkk arñantar* (cf. TEB I, 74, § 63).

Klingenschmitt, 1994, 349 = 2005, 385 claimed that in *po lläklenta* < pre-PT *pās luglonta geminate -*ll*- is just the preserved lautgesetzlich outcome of the underlying sequence *-s#l-. In a similar fashion (fn. 69), he explained the geminate in the example TA *oki śśaśmuräs* as preserved lautgesetzlich reflex of the former root initial TA *s't'*- (from the root ^A*ṣtäm*^(a)- Kaus. I 'put'). According to him, the Tocharian phenomenon of gemination at word boundaries had originated precisely in such cases. On the other hand, especially in Tocharian B we often find rather the opposite phenomenon, viz. instances of degemination at word boundaries, such as *alyeksa* instead of etymologically correct *alyek ksa* (cf. TEB I, 74, § 63, fn. 2), so that one could also toy with the idea that the gemination phenomenon was at least partly due to hypercorrection. As a matter of fact, somewhat similar processes can be found in other languages as well, such as the Italian *Rafforzamento* (or *Raddoppiamento*) *Fonosintattico* (see, e.g., Repetti, 1991, 307ff.; Loporcaro, 1997; Marotta, 2008, 237f.),[25] and the sporadic word-final and word-initial gemination of Ancient Greek (see, e.g., Solmsen, 1901, 166, Anm.; West, 1967, 113 with ref.; this

---

[24] For *se* as the informal-style variant of the relative pronoun *k͡use*, cf. Stumpf, 1990, 68.

[25] "A strengthening that is observed after certain function words and after words with a final tonic vowel ... The process was historically triggered by the assimilation at word boundaries between an etymologically final consonant and a following initial consonant" (Marotta, l.c.).

feature of gemination is referred to by the term of 'lengthening' in Eben, 2004), but not any of these parallels have precisely the same restrictions as found in Tocharian B. Because of this, all in all I think it is best to assume that the whole process had spread from the more informal styles into the more formal styles, regardless of its possible further origin(s), and this I think will also hold for the gemination in PPts, as will be argued in chap. PPt 14.2.2.

Especially in Tocharian A we sometimes find word-initial gemination in front of *r*, *y*, and *w* with no morpheme boundary involved at all, cf., e.g., TA *kuppre* beside *kupre*; see the examples in Klingenschmitt, 1994, 346f. = 2005, 383f., who rightly claimed that such sonorants and glides "in anderen Sprachen ebenfalls die Gemination vorausgehender Konsonanten bewirken können"; see the discussion in Méndez Dosuna, 1994, 114f.

Even odder kinds of what seems to be word-internal spontaneous gemination can be met within Tocharian B, cf., e.g., *-rkk-* in the PPt *tsetsärkkoṣ* 295 a 3 (MQ) from *tsärk-* 'heat' or the sequence *-rtt-* even rather regularly met in forms built from the root *ārt(t)[(a)]-* 'love'. These geminates may have to do with the fact that in Tocharian B there existed already lautgesetzlich sequences *-rtt-* due to the sound law PT *-tw- > TB *-tt-*; but note that such writings are sporadically found also in both Ancient Greek inscriptions (see, e.g., Hermann, 1923, 112, 118f.,122) and in the Rik-Prātiśākhyas (see, e.g., Hock, 1991, 128f. with ref.). Even a gemination of the Latin *littera* type seems to be found in the 2.pl. Ipv *cisso* 108 a 2 and a 8 (S) from *i-* 'go', a variant of *(p)cīso*, itself a quite irregular outcome of what must have been pre-TB *päyäcäso. Since this form comes from an eastern text and from a manuscript that has many (other) informal and hypercorrect forms,[26] one may conclude that this kind of gemination is also some kind of progressive-style phenomenon that has to be viewed together with the tendency of these styles to simplify consonant clusters.

---

[26] Such as *kärstoca* for *kärstauca* or hypercorrect 3.sg.mid. Opt *tsälpauytr̄ä* for *tsälpoytr̄ä*.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION INTO THE TOCHARIAN VERBAL SYSTEM

2.1.   THE GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES OF THE TOCHARIAN VERB

As it seems, from any Tocharian verbal root there could be formed a present stem, a subjunctive stem, a preterit stem, an imperative stem, and a preterit participle. From the present stem there were built the indicative present and the imperfect, a gerundive and respective abstract, and further what I call *nt*-participle and *m*-participle. In Tocharian A, also the infinitive was formed from the present stem. From the subjunctive stem there were formed the subjunctive itself, the optative, and likewise a gerundive and a respective abstract, and, quite remarkably, the infinitive in Tocharian B. From the preterit stem only the finite preterit was built; similarly, the imperative stem only formed imperative forms. There are twelve present classes, ten subjunctive classes, eight preterit classes, and seven imperative classes to be kept distinct. In general, I follow the classifications as adopted by the Sieg school and used in the manuals TG, WTG, and TEB with only very few exceptions. As will be discussed in detail in the respective chapters, I prefer to call the present participles *nt*-participle and *m*-participle instead of "active" and "middle" present participles; I introduce a preterit Class 0 called "root preterit" which was labeled asigmatic *s*-preterit by the manuals (of the type TA *lyokät*); I altered the classification of nasal presents in Tocharian A, so that there is now a Class VII nasal present in Tocharian A as well, which is, however, descriptively different from the TB Class VII present; finally, I slightly altered assignments of imperative forms regarding Classes VI and VII.

2.2.   GRUNDVERB AND KAUSATIVUM

The manuals basing themselves on the Sieg School also work with the concept of "Grundverb" opposed to "Kausativum". Descriptively, many Tocharian verbal roots have two or even three different sets of paradigms, the second and third of which mostly (but not always) have a valency different from that of the first ones, and quite often

function as true causatives to the first ones. For a more detailed
account and the relevant terminology I opted for, see chap. Valency.

2.3.   A-CHARACTER VS. NON-A-CHARACTER

I define that a Tocharian root has A-character whenever it forms a
subjunctive in stem-final PT *-ā-, i.e., a Class V or VI subjunctive,
basically following Hackstein, 1995, 16, fn. 3 (but differently 139);
Winter, 1965 = 2005, 106ff.; Schmidt, 1982, 363ff.; see most recently
Pinault, 2008, 575f.[1] Having or not having A-character is a key
property with respect to paradigmatic affiliation. In this study, I
therefore consistently indicate whether a root has A-character or not.
A-character is marked by a superscripted ^{a} after the root based on the
practice of indicating seṭ character of Sanskrit roots by a superscripted
^{i} (e.g., *pälk^a-* 'see'). In contrast, roots not having such a superscripted ^{a}
do not have A-character (e.g., *pälk-* 'shine'). If it is uncertain whether a
root has A-character or non-A-character, I indicate this fact by adding
a superscripted question mark $^?$ to the root final (e.g., ^{A}*pew$^{a?}$-* 'card',
for which A-character can be assumed but is not attested with
certainty). Many roots have A-character in the grundverb, but lose it
in the kausativum. These roots are marked by a superscripted $^{(a)}$ (e.g.,
pälk$^{(a)}$- 'burn').

    For what I think are the various sources of that root-final PT *-ā-,
see especially the chapter on Pt I.

2.4.   ABLAUT

Tocharian has preserved the PIE principle of root ablaut fairly well in
the verbal system, which cannot be said of the nominal system. The
most remarkable ablaut feature of Tocharian is the creation of
neological zero grades to roots of the structure PIE *√Cei̯/u̯(C). See
the discussion by Adams, 1978a, 446ff.; Penney, 1978, 74ff.; Ringe,
1996, 135ff.; Hackstein, 1998, 228. According to these authors, beside
and instead of the lautgesetzlich zero-grade *ä* < pre-PT *u, *i, a
neological zero grade TB/TA *i* and TB/TA *u* was created via
analogical introduction of the glides *y and *w into the lautgesetzlich

---

[1] Marggraf, 1970, passim and Hilmarsson, 1991, 73ff. have a different
concept of A-character, which, however, is completely arbitrary; see the
discussion in chap. Sub I/V 18.4.3.

zero grades of the structure *Cä(C)-, evidently on the model of roots
with the shape CeR(C)-:

PIE	Early PT	Late PT	TB	TA
*Co̯iC/*CiC, etc.	*CæyC/*CäC	*CæyC/*CäyC	CaiC/CiC	CeC/CiC
*Co̯uC/*CuC, etc.	*CæwC/*CäC	*CæwC/*CäwC	CauC/CuC	CoC/CuC
*CoRC/*CR̥C, etc.	*CæRC/*CäRC	*CæRC/*CäRC	CeRC/CäRC	CaRC/CäRC

Note, however, that this is not the only explanation to get to the
historically attested forms. A reshaping of the kind *Ci(C)- > *Cäy(C)-,
*Cu(C)- > *Cäw(C)-, based again on the model of *CäR(C)-, would also
lead to the attested forms. As a matter of fact, it may even be easier to
get from *Ci(C)- to *Cäy(C)- than from *C'ä(C)- with root-initial
palatalization to *Cäy(C)- with no root-initial palatalization, but this
argument is, of course, cogent only to scholars who, as I do, believe in
a palatalizing quality of pre-PT, or PT, *i. Finally, it has to be pointed
out that the evidence of the so-called *u*-umlaut, caused by the former
presence of a short *u, which on its side could even have developed
out of a pre-PT *ä standing after a labial, certainly does not militate in
favor of an early sound law *u > *ä. Note finally that the roots *mäsk-*
'(ex)change' and *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'decide' behave with respect to apophony
precisely as any root of the (*)CäRC type.

The Verbal Endings

3.1.   The PIE Verbal Endings

As is well known, there is still much debate going on with respect to the setting up of a number of PIE verbal endings. Hopefully, the following list will not look too absurd to the majority of users. For simplicity's sake, I deliberately omit here the dual endings.

Primary endings

"*mi*-Conjugation"
Active

	Athem.	Them.		Athem.	Them.
1.sg.	*-mi	*-ō[1]	1.pl.	*-me/os(i)	*-o-me/os(i)
2.sg.	*-s(i)	*-e-s(i)	2.pl.	*-th$_2$e ± ne	*-e-th$_2$e ± ne
3.sg.	*-ti	*-e-ti	3.pl.	*-(e)nti	*-o-nti

Middle (I)

	Athem.	Them.		Athem.	Them.
1.sg.	*-h$_2$(e)i̯/r	*-o-h$_2$(e)i̯/r	1.pl.	*-me/osd^{h}h$_2$	*-o-me/osd^{h}h$_2$
2.sg.	*-soi̯/r	*-e-soi̯/r	2.pl.	*-d^{h}h$_2$u̯e/o ± i̯/r[2]	*-e-d^{h}h$_2$u̯e/o ± i̯/r
3.sg.	*-toi̯/r	*-e-toi̯/r	3.pl.	*-(e)ntoi̯/r	*-o-ntoi̯/r

---

[1] Usually set up as *-o-h$_2$; see, most recently, Klingenschmitt, 2005a, 124; Tichy, 2006, 238, 240.

[2] As per Melchert, 1984, 26 (see now also Klingenschmitt, 2005a, 127, fn. 34); usually the ending is reconstructed without the laryngeal; see esp. Jasanoff, 2003, 48.

Secondary endings

Active

	Athem.	Them.		Athem.	Them.
1.sg.	*-m	*-o-m	1.pl.	*-me/o	*-o-me/o
2.sg.	*-s	*-e-s	2.pl.	*-te	*-e-te
3.sg.	*-t	*-e-t	3.pl.	*-(e)nt	*-o-nt

Middle (I)

	Athem.	Them.		Athem.	Them.
1.sg.	*-h$_2$(e)	*-o-h$_2$e	1.pl.	*-me/od^{h}h$_2$	*-o-me/od^{h}h$_2$
2.sg.	*-so	*-e-so	2.pl.	*-d^{h}h$_2$u̯e/o	*-e-d^{h}h$_2$u̯e/o
3.sg.	*-to	*-e-to	3.pl.	*-(e)nto[3]	*-o-nto

Endings of the h$_2$e-conjugation (Middle II/active perfect)

1.sg.	*-h$_2$e(i̯/r)	1.pl.	?
2.sg.	*-th$_2$e(i̯/r)/*-th$_2$ās[4]	2.pl.	*-(H)e?
3.sg.	*-e/o(i̯/r)	3.pl.	*-r̥(s)/*-ĕr(s)/*-ro(i̯/r)

The Tocharian verbal endings as a whole have recently been discussed by Cavoto, 2004, 227ff. A principal stand was made by Adams, 1993, 20ff., who assumed that the present/subjunctive endings in general go back to the PIE primary ending set. Like Winter, 1990a, 16ff. = 2005, 377ff., Adams suggests that the final *-i of the primary endings could have been truncated "facultatively", so that variants came into being that looked like secondary endings, and that further after the loss of final *-t, Tocharian ended up with a "long" and "short" ending set. According to Adams, in the end Tocharian B generalized the "short" forms, and Tocharian A the longer ones, with the exception of the 3.pl. active where Tocharian A preserved both variants.

---

[3] *-ntro according to Klingenschmitt, 2005a, 122, 128 (see also Jasanoff, 2003, 52ff.).

[4] There is no compelling Celtic evidence in favor of *-th$_2$ēs; see McCone, 2006, 140.

3.2.   THE ENDINGS OF THE PRESENT AND SUBJUNCTIVE STEMS

Active

	Athematic		Thematic	
	TB	TA	TB	TA
1.sg.	*-u, -m*	*-m*	*-e͡u/-au*	*-am*
2.sg.	*-t(o)*	*-t*	*'-t(o)*	*'-t*
3.sg.	*-ṃ*	*-ṣ*	*'-äṃ*	*'-äṣ*
1.pl.	*-m(o)*	*-mäs*	*-em(o)*	*-amäs*
2.pl.	*-cer*	*-c*	*'-cer*	*'-c*
3.pl.	*-ṃ*	*-iñc/-i*	*-eṃ*	*-eñc/-e*

Middle

	Athematic		Thematic	
	TB	TA	TB	TA
1.sg.	*-mar*	*-mār*	*-emar*	*-amār*
2.sg.	*-tar*	*-tār*	*'-tar*	*'-tār*
3.sg.	*-tär*	*-tär*	*'-tär*	*'-tär*
1.pl.	*-mtär*	*-mtär*	*-em(n)tär*	*-amtär*
2.pl.	*-tär*	*-cär*	*'-tär*	*'-cär*
3.pl.	*-ntär*	*-ntär*	*-entär*	*-antär*

3.2.1. *Active*

3.2.1.1.   *1.sg. active*

In Tocharian B the athematic ending is /-äw/ (written ⟨-*u*⟩) after non-syllabics (cf. *āyu* 'I give'), and "/w/ after non-thematic vowel (cf. *kārau* 'I will gather')", as per Winter, 1990a, 15 = 2005, 376, i.e., the second element of a diphthong *-āw > /-aw/ (written ⟨-*au*⟩) in the subjunctive and present Classes V and VI. The thematic ending of the present and subjunctive is written -*ew*, -*e͡u* in old manuscripts, and -*au* in standard Tocharian B.[5] Note that the thematic variant, i.e., -*au* could be introduced into athematic stems (e.g., 1.sg. Prs *nese͡u/nesau* 'I am'), which is a development also attested for other persons of basically athematic stems. An exceptional 1.sg. active present ending -*m*

---

[5] -*e͡u* is confined to the oldest manuscripts; see Stumpf, 1990, 80 with fn. 47 and Peyrot, 2008, 42 (cf., e.g., *lkaske͡u* in the paleographically archaic manuscript Kucha 0187 (= Or.8212/1379) a 1, on which see Malzahn, 2007a, 268).

appears in the monosyllable *yam* 'I go'. This *-m* is also the normal 1.sg. active ending of the imperfect and, respectively, optative. 1.sg. optative forms in *-im* usually have the accent on the *-i-*, thereby attesting to the former existence of word-final *-ä (e.g., *yamim* from *yām-* 'do'), but unlike in the case of the similarly structured 2.sg. active ending *-t* < *-tä*, no variants with *o* mobile or preserved final *-ä are attested for the *-m* of the 1. singular. Tocharian A has the ending TA *-m* in all categories and classes without exception.

TB/TA *-m* most certainly derives from PIE *-mi. On the other hand, there are a lot of different views about the source of the *w/u*-element in Tocharian B, cf., e.g., the statement by Hackstein, 1995, 151f., fn. 7 that its derivation "bleibt m. E. eine offene Frage". For earlier approaches, see VW II/2, 261.

Derivation of TB *-u* from PIE *-ō was at first proposed by Pedersen, 1941, 141, followed by Lane, 1976, 140ff.; van Brock, 1977, 78ff.; Pinault, 1989, 153f.; 1994, 130ff.; 2008, 620; Ringe, 1996, 89. Since a word-final PIE *-ō# in general turned at first into Late pre-PT/Early PT *-ŭ# (causing the so-called *u*-umlaut) before it was finally lost in both languages, one would have to assume that the verbal ending was irregularly preserved due to its morphological function (as already pointed out by Hilmarsson, 1986, 47f.; 1988a, 514). In addition, one would, of course, also have to assume that TB *-u*, /-w/ had secondarily spread to the athematic verbal categories.

Other scholars suggested that TB *-u* somehow derived from pre-PT *-u̯i or *-u̯a, most of them thinking that the *-u̯-element had originated in the domain of the PIE active perfect and therefore also had to do with the preterit ending of the 1.sg. PT *-wā (for which see below 3.3.1.1); see VW II/2, 261 (followed by Adams, 1988a, 52ff., but note the later objections made in Adams, 1993, 22f. with fn. 16); Pinault, 1989, 153 and 2008, 620 (trying to connect TB *-u* with Luwian *-wi̯*); and above all G. Schmidt, 1995, 68ff. (esp. 71), who after having pointed out that the 2.sg. active Prs/Sub ending TB/TA *-t* clearly seems to derive from an active perfect ending, and that the Sub I and V forms clearly seem to derive from perfect forms, concluded that "die nur an idg. Pf.-Endungen bzw. toch. Prt.-Endungen anknüpfbaren Prs.- und Konj.-Endungen 2. sg. AB *-t*, 1. sg. B *-u* über den Konj. ins Prs. gelangt sein [werden]".

Finally, there is the strategy to derive TB *-u* from PIE *-m(i) by some kind of lenition. Actually, lenition of *-m(-) > *-u/w(-)* was at first proposed by Sieg/Siegling, apud TochSprR(A), VI, fn. 2, and argued in detail by Couvreur, 1938, 243ff.; see also Couvreur, 1947a, 55, § 93;

Pinault, 1989, 153; 2008, 620; Adams, 1993, 22f.; in addition, Klingenschmitt, 1994, 405ff. = 2005, 430ff. assumed that lenition and preservation of *-m(-) were a matter of word length. According to this author, the pre-PT ending *-mi resulted by sound law in PT *-mä whenever it formed part of a disyllabic form, and was turned by sound law into PT *-wä in polysyllabic forms, "*ä* nach *u̯*" then being subject to early loss, and -*m* tending to being generalized in Tocharian A. For the assumption of a development *-mi > *-(ä)mi > *-(ä)w ("nicht *-(ä)wä") > *-(ä)w/-u*, see most recently Peters, 2004, 434.

Finally, Winter, 1990a, 15ff. = 2005, 376ff. derived -*e̯u* and -*u* from PIE *-om and *-m̥ by claiming the development *-Vm > *Vw to have been confined to the context of following *ñ*, which he said could be supplied by the 1.sg. pronoun *ñiś* (followed by Hilmarsson, 1991a, 64; but see the objections by Adams, 1993, 17).

Summing up, I think one would very much like to derive TB -*u*, /-w/ from (pre-)PT *-mi, but since it would be completely arbitrary to assume an early reduction *-wä > *-w, one will have to resort to the morphologically second best solution, i.e., to derive it from (pre-)PT word-final *-m. As a matter of fact, such an analysis would tally nicely with the two facts that -*au* also functions as genuine preterit ending (of Pt Class VI) and that at least also the TB present/subjunctive ending of the 3.pl. active has to be derived from a (pre-)PT ending devoid of final *-i, see below 3.2.1.6.

3.2.1.2.   *2.sg. active*

The 2.sg. active ending is -*t* in Tocharian A, and this is also the usual outcome in Tocharian B. However, there the accent still shows that the ending had the former structure (*)-*tä*, and the final (*)-*ä* is still reflected by some writings with so-called *o* mobile (cf. Krause, 1951, 151, fn. 21; TEB I, 255, § 455,3); it is even still written -*ä* in some manuscripts with archaic ductus: cf. 2.sg. *yamästä* 'you do' in 295 b 6 (pāda-final position), 2.sg. Imp *ṣaitä* 'you were' in 273 b 5 (pāda-final position). On the other hand, in a letter, i.e., an informal-style document, kept by the Museum in Ürümqi edited by Schmidt, 1997, 235f., we have now the 2.sg. Prs *aista-ne* and 2.sg. Sub *aita-ne* showing an "auffällig[en] ... Sproßvokal". The same allomorph is now also attested in THT 1178 a 1: *lāre nesta-ñ twe* • "you are dear to me". Since the input to all these forms is expected to have been trisyllabic PT *næsätä-, etc., the output to be expected was, of course, TB *nest-ñ*, etc. There indeed exist quite a lot of 2.sg. active forms followed by a clitic which also have a monosyllabic surfacing stem in front of the

ending and show the expected syncope of the *-ä- that followed the
desinence-initial (*)-t-.[6] Most probably we are dealing here with a
special feature of the informal styles, in which (as a result of a deletion
of a morpheme boundary, which is quite typical a feature of informal
styles) the underlying form of the 2.sg. Prs of *nes-* may always have
been disyllabic PT *næstä rather than trisyllabic PT *næsätä.

According to many scholars, (*)-*tä* is to be derived from the PIE
Middle II/perfect ending *-th₂a (see, e.g., Krause, 1951, 151f.; TEB I,
258, § 462,1; VW II/2, 261ff.; Pinault, 1989, 154; Adams, 1993, 20). There
is, however, the problem that PIE *a was expected to result in PT *-ā,
as has indeed been the case in the respective preterit ending *-stā, as
already pointed out by Pedersen, 1944, 5. The claim that TB/TA -*t* is
"lautgesetzlich aus idg. *-tH₂a entstanden" (as per G. Schmidt, 1985, 74
with further ref.) is by now completely outdated. On the other hand,
many scholars as early as Meillet, who was first followed by Pedersen,
1944, 5 and Couvreur, 1947a, 55, § 93, assumed some kind of influence
from an enclitic pronoun *tŭ (which means that they either derive
(*)-*tä* directly from such a *tŭ or assume an original sequence
*-tā+*tŭ): see Cowgill, 1985, 104f. = 2006, 73; Adams, 1988, 17; 1993, 19,
fn. 7; Winter, 1990a, 27f.; Klingenschmitt, 1994, 409 = 2005, 434;
Hackstein, 2001, 24f.; Pinault, 2008, 620. Differently, Peters, 2004, 438,
fn. 40 proposes irregular weakening of (of course unaccented) pre-PT
*-a > PT *-ā in an ending; see also Hackstein, 2004a, 289.[7]

There is, of course, the further problem that one does not expect a
Middle II/perfect ending to show up in active present/subjunctive
paradigms. This problem has been explicitly addressed by G. Schmidt,
1995, 71 (see above sub 3.2.1.1), and can, of course, easily be solved
within the general framework of Jay Jasanoff. Note, however, the fact
that in archaic Greek poetry the old perfect ending -σθα can perfectly
well act as a primary ending, which is probably owed to the fact that
for the di- and polysyllabic present and subjunctive stems of Greek no
ending *-si was available, which may also have been true for pre-PT.

---

[6] *west-meśca* 'you say to me' in 273 b 3 (MQ, metrical); *went-meśca* 'you
will say to us/them' in St. 42.2.1 a 3 (MQ, metrical; see Malzahn, 2007a, 268);
yust-me 'you turn towards me' in 273 b 3 (MQ, metrical) from *yuwästä-me*
(cf. *yuwäst* with analogically restored *-wä- in KVāc 30 b 2). Whether *prekṣtañ*
in 351 a 3 is another example of accented -*tä*- is difficult to judge. *śwāt-ne* in H
149.add 123 a 2 (thus WTG, 294) is not relevant here, because one has to read
tuwe śwāt ta[ṃ] • (Broomhead I, 294; Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 157).

[7] It is possible that the same kind of weakening in a final syllable is also
met in some Sub V forms with -*ä*- instead of *-a-; see chap. Sub I/V 18.2.1.

3.2.1.3.   *3.sg. active*

Tocharian A and B show different present/subjunctive endings in the 3.sg. active, viz. TA -ṣ, TB -ṃ. At least at first glance, it seems these two endings cannot go back to any common proto-form or to any proto-form plausibly reconstructed for PIE at all.

Until recently, a popular theory derived both TB -ṃ and TA -ṣ from two different enclitic pronouns or particles required to have been attached to 3.sg. active forms ending in pre-PT *-t (and not *-ti). Such a solution has been at first proposed by Meillet in Lévi/Meillet, 1912, 8; see the ref. in VW II/2, 264. As for Tocharian B, Adams, 1988a, 56 reckons with a sentence particle *nu (objections by Winter, 1990a, 18f. = 2005, 379f., who rather opts for pronominal *no "in subject function"; see also the later defense by Adams, 1993, 16ff. and 26f.); similarly, Pinault, 1989, 154 compares the adverb *nu 'now' (Gk. νῦν, etc.). For the assumption of a pronominal particle see beside Winter, 1990a, 19 = 2005, 380 also Klingenschmitt, 1994, 409 = 2005, 434. Differently, TEB I, 258f., § 463,1 speculated about deriving the 3.sg. forms from 3.pl. forms, and similarly Lane, 1976, 152 assumed substitution of thematic 3.sg. *-e-t by *-e-nt after thematic 3.pl. *-o-nt. Again differently, Peters, 2004, 435ff., resorts to the principle of hypercorrection, taking as his starting point the verbum substantivum. Peters reckons that word-final nasals were lost earlier in the informal styles than in the formal ones, so that in a frequent verb (*)-*n* may have started to vary with -ø even in the standard forms of the 3. plural, and based on such a variation in the plural he says a nasal could be introduced hypercorrectly into the 3. singular as well.

As for the derivation of the TA ending, Krause, 1951, 155ff. (and WTG, 200; TEB I, 259, § 463,1) proposed a merger of the 3. with the 2.sg. resulting in a generalization of the 2.sg. *-si, but for the typological parallels invoked by Krause, see rather Ross/Crossland, 1954, 112ff., who argue that all of these alleged parallels have to be explained otherwise. Just like in the case of Tocharian B, derivation from a particle (*-si vel sim.) has also been assumed for TA -ṣ, e.g., by Pinault, 1989, 154, and even analogical introduction from the *s*-present was advocated by Levet, 1991, 168 (which is completely ad hoc). In 1987, however, Jasanoff, 1987, 110f. and Klingenschmitt, 1987, 188 = 2005, 266, fn. 64 (also 1994, 409 = 2005, 434) independently proposed two different phonological developments by both of which PIE *-ti/*-dʰi would eventually turn into PT *-ṣ(ä). Jasanoff/Klingenschmitt were then followed by Hackstein, most recently in 2007, 134 (with new evidence in favor of such an outcome of pre-PT

*-ti) and Peters, 2004, 435. In contrast, Pinault, 2006a, 268ff.; 2008, 620 does not accept a sound law *-Vti# > -ṣ, and instead sets up a sound law of progressive palatalization *-eT# > *-äṣ, which would also explain the TA ending directly (for Tocharian B he still works with a particle *nä). Jasanoff, 1987, 111, fn. 44 even toys with the idea that -ṣ was analogically turned into *-nṣ in both languages, and that this ending finally resulted in TB -ṃ on the one hand and TA -ṣ on the other hand, cf. the parallel development *-Vns# > TB -ṃ and TA -s in the obliquus plural, as per Gippert, 1987, 25ff. The advantage of such a scenario is, of course, the possibility to derive the seemingly completely different endings of the two languages from one single common ancestor form. However, if one would not like to opt for Jasanoff's explanation, it would again be inevitable to assume (as already in the case of the 1.sg., see above 3.2.1.1) that the TB ending was the outcome of a (pre-)PT ending devoid of primary *-i; see for a general discussion below sub 3.2.1.6.

Finally, there can be no doubt that in the TB 3.sg. active forms of the optative (which otherwise simply shows Prs/Sub endings), the irregular zero ending is to be derived from bare secondary *-t (-i from pre-PT *-ī-t, and -oy from pre-PT *-āi̯-t). In this very special case the use of PIE *-t devoid of final *-i does not cause us trouble at all, because it can be taken for an archaism even inherited from PIE. In Tocharian A, the endings of the optative forms are always the same as the ones found in the present and subjunctive forms.

3.2.1.4.   *1.pl. active*

It is usually assumed that TA -*mäs* goes back to a primary ending with attached *-i PIE *-mesi;[8] on the other hand, TB -*m(o)* is certainly to be derived from *i*-less PIE *-me or *-mes (which would have

---

[8] See, however, the ample discussion of the phonological aspects in Malzahn, 2007, 241, fn. 15. In contrast, Pinault, 2006a, 270 does not believe that *-si should have yielded -ṣ, and therefore can derive TA -*mäs* directly from *-mesi. Pinault actually made a quite excellent case for pre-PT *si > PT *sä (without palatalization) by pointing to TB *esale*, TA *asäl* 'post', the (*)-*ä*- of which cannot, of course, go back neither to pre-PT *-e- nor pre-PT *-u-. Whoever would nevertheless not like to join Pinault in his conclusion, would have to resort to assuming that the (*)-*ä*- in the 'post' word does not derive from any PIE vowel at all, but from a prop vowel *-ä- that had developed within an *-sl- cluster in (pre-)PT.

yielded TA †-*m*); see TEB I, 259, § 465; VW II/2, 266ff.; Pinault, 1989, 154; 2008, 621; Klingenschmitt, 1994, 410 = 2005, 434.

3.2.1.5.   *2.pl. active*

Tocharian B shows -*cer* as 2.pl. active ending, Tocharian A has -*c*, and the latter can smoothly be derived from PIE *-te, cf. TEB I, 259, § 466; VW II/2, 268f.; Pinault, 1989, 54; 2008, 621; Klingenschmitt, 1994, 410 = 2005, 434f. On the other hand, TB -*cer* can only be derived from *-cær < *-t'ē + r(V) from PIE *-tē. The *-ē of *-te → *-tē has either been explained in terms of a sound law (thus Lane, 1976, 135), a "rhythmische Dehnung" (thus Klingenschmitt, 1994, 410 = 2005, 434), and analogy (thus Van Windekens, VW II/2, 269 with ref.); note especially Tichy, 2000, 85: "Auslautendes *-*e* in den Sekundär-endungen der 1. Dual sowie der 1. und 2. Plural wurde wohl unter dem Akzent [...] zu *-e gelängt". As for the added *r*-element, it is traditionally assumed that it was transferred from the middle *r*-endings, though it is not easy to see why such a transfer to an active ending should have been made at all. Pinault, 1989, 154 therefore refers to the particle TB *ra* 'aussi', while Peters, 2004, 438f., fn. 41 reckons with hypercorrection.

3.2.1.6.   *3.pl. active*

Tocharian B shows consistently -*ṃ*, Tocharian A has two sets of 3.pl. active present/subjunctive endings: one with final -*ñc*, and another lacking that final -*ñc*. Usually, TB -*ṃ* is derived from PIE secondary *-(e/o)nt, and TA -*ñc* from PIE primary *-(e/o)nti (see Pedersen, 1941, 143f.; TEB I, 259, § 467; VW II/2, 269ff.). As for the short variants of TA lacking final -*ñc* that end in mere -*e* or -*i* (the instances of which have been collected by Hilmarsson, 1989, 124f.), most of them are attested in the Berlin MSN manuscript, whereas such forms only very rarely show up in other manuscripts, as was already pointed out in TG, 326, § 412; see now Itkin, 2002, 14.[9] Since those short variants are usually only found when followed by an enclitic pronoun,[10] Itkin rightly

---

[9] Itkin, 2002, passim also discusses other features of the MSN manuscript not shared by any other TA manuscripts suggesting that it really stands apart from the rest (as actually already noticed by Sieg/Siegling in TochSprR(A), VIII) and hence showing that in contrast to the communis opinio, "differences do exist between texts written in Tocharian A".

[10] This fact clearly militates strongly against the claim made by Cowgill, 1985, 104f. = 2006, 73 that the longer forms go back to proto-forms "containing

concludes that this has indeed been the original domain of them. Of course one would then like to make the further guess that diachronically, the short variants developed out of the longer ones by mere truncation, and should not be traced back to PIE or (pre-)PT proto-forms other than the ones to be set up for the longer ones in -ñc.[11]

There is then no problem in deriving TA -ñc from PIE > (pre-)PT *-nti,[12] and TB -ṃ from (pre-)PT *-nt. The latter derivation tallies nicely with the facts that TB -eṃ can indeed also function synchronically as a preterit ending (viz. of Pt VI),[13] and that the TB active present/subjunctive endings of all of the other persons (including most notably the 1.sg. and the 3.sg.) are to be derived from (pre-)PT proto-forms devoid of final *-i as well. The latter fact is, of course, surprising, because it is hard to find any morphosyntactic reason why Tocharian B (in contrast to Tocharian A) should have used the PIE *secondary* endings as present endings (NB in the active only) rather than the PIE primary ones. I therefore like to side with Adams, 1993, 20ff. and the other scholars who like him[14] prefer to derive the TB endings (NB: not the TA endings) from a (pre-)PT set of

---

a further pronominal or other element, conceivably the same as in A 3rd sg. -ṣ".

[11] Compare the situation with the 3.pl. active Pt endings discussed below sub 3.3.1.6.; there can be little doubt that TB -ār used in front of enclitics arose by weakening of PT *-āræ in this same context. But of course one cannot completely exclude in theory that in the same position in front of enclitics morphologically older forms have been preserved. As a matter of fact, many scholars assumed that the short endings of TA were somewhat more original/archaic than or at least as original/archaic as the longer ones, among them Kortlandt, 1979 = 2007, 5 (who wanted to derive them from a PIE 3.pl. ending *-o); Cowgill, 1985, 104f. = 2006, 73, 548 (claiming pre-PT *-nti > PT *-n > TB -ṃ/ pre-TA *-y following Szemerényi); Hilmarsson, 1989, 124f.; Pinault, 2008, 621; see also Ringe, 1990, 233f., fn. 40; 1996, 76ff.

[12] Of course, PIE *h₁u̯ih₁ḱm̥ti 'twenty' resulted in TA *wiki* devoid of final -ñc and looking like one of those short variants of the 3.pl. active Prs/Sub forms, but it is well known that numerals tend to undergo irregular sound change.

[13] As a matter of fact, the Cowgill/Ringe school claims that pre-PT *-nt even if found after a short vowel would not have led to TB -ṃ, but would have vanished completely (see most recently Kim, 2001, 121, fn. 5 and against this claim, Peters, 2004, 436, fn. 35).

[14] For instances, Peters, 2004, 435ff., who, however, did not include here the 1.sg. ending /-w/.

endings devoid of final *-i which itself did not derive from the PIE secondary endings, but from a (pre-)PT outcome of the PIE primary endings showing irregular truncation of final *-i, maybe originally only to be found in the paradigm of the verbum substantivum.[15]

3.2.2. *Middle*

As mark of the non-preterit middle endings, Tocharian has generalized a final *r*-element through the whole paradigm.[16]

3.2.2.1.   *1.sg. middle*

In both languages the ending goes back to PT *-mār. The *-m-* as part of a 1. singular ending is unproblematic; the element *-ār* has been compared with *-ōr of Celtic and Italic, see Watkins, 1969, 191 with ref.; similarly about a PIE 1.sg.mid. ending PIE *-ōr, G. Schmidt, 1977, 107, fn. 105, but see later G. Schmidt, 1982, 349, fn. 45. Pinault, 1989, 155 sets up *-mā + *-r(i), with *-mā < *-m-h_2 (mere *-h_2 apparently presupposed by Ved. *-i*, but see Jasanoff, 2003, 47 with ref.) or, alternatively, *-m-h_2e. Likewise Klingenschmitt, 1994, 406 = 2005, 431 fn. 163; 2005a, 126, fn. 32. works with "Umbildung von uridg. *-h_2a", and similarly also Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 55 by setting up *m(e)-h_2e ± ri.

3.2.2.2.   *2.sg. middle*

In both languages the ending goes back to PT *-tār. We are apparently dealing with the PIE Middle II ending *-th$_2$e > *-tā enlarged by the ubiquitous middle *r*-element, cf. Jasanoff, 2003, 47. There is nothing wrong, of course, with *-th$_2$e being used in a middle ending, but in theory, *-tār could also have been coined quite recently on the basis of the following analogical proportion: *-mä : *-tä :: *-mār : x, x = *-tār.

---

[15] As per Peters, 2004, 439. Parallels for such an irregular treatment of final *-nti would be provided by *ikäṃ* 'twenty' (and somehow, of course, also by TA *wiki* and the TA short variants of the 3.pl. active Prs/Sub endings), and as per Hackstein, 2007, 135 with fn. 9, also by the ablative ending *-meṃ*.

[16] On the question of the middle element *r*, see basically Watkins, 1969, 174ff.; Jasanoff, 1977, 159ff. and 2003, 46; Klingenschmitt, 1994, 410 = 2005, 434f.; 2005a, 122ff. At least in Tocharian, there is no evidence for an original final vowel *-i.

3.2.2.3. *3.sg. middle*

Both languages show the ending *-tär/-trä.* As for the alternation of *-tär* and *-trä* (*-tr* in sandhi before vowels), there is no obvious distributional pattern to be found; see Peyrot, 2008, 61 with fn. 55, who has been the most recent scholar to assume that we have to do here with "a marginal phoneme /ṛ/". From a diachronic point of view, we expect *-tor as preform (rather than the *-tro advocated by Pedersen, 1941, 154), which should, of course, develop into PT *-tær. Therefore, some scholars proposed to set up either an ending *-tṛ (G. Schmidt, 1977, 96f. with ref.) or *-tri (Jasanoff, 1977, 161ff., followed by, e.g., Pinault, 1989, 155, but now given up by both Jasanoff, 2003, 46 and Pinault, 2008, 622f.), while others assumed a weakening process PIE *o → *ä in posttonic context, e.g., van Brock, 1978, 227ff.; most recently Peters, 2004, 438, fn. 40 with ref. (who also objects to Ringe's assumption, 1996, 86f. of *-tor > *-tur). See also the ref. in VW II/2, 274f.

3.2.2.4. *1.pl. middle*

Peyrot, 2008, 155ff. shows that the older TB ending is *-mtär/-mträ* (= TA *-mtär/trä*) and that the TB variant given as *-mttär* by the manuals should in fact rather be read *-mntär.* The latter is confined to the informal/eastern variety of Tocharian B (or later language, as preferred by Peyrot), while it never shows up in archaic texts. While both readings *-mttär* and *-mntär* are paleographically possible, Peyrot argues cogently that we have here an informal-style, i.e., progressive sound change *mt > mnt* parallel to *mc > mñc* and *mk > mṅk.*

For the etymology, see the overview in VW II/2, 276. There can be little doubt that the ending goes back to PIE *-medʰh₁ (with the ubiquitous *-r* of the middle Prs/Sub endings added secondarily), *-är* instead of expected (*)-*ār* being due either to analogical reshaping or irregular weakening of a PT full vowel as also assumed for the 2.sg. active and the 3.sg. and 3.pl. middle endings of the present/ subjunctive ending set.

3.2.2.5. *2.pl. middle*

The two languages clearly differ: Tocharian B shows *-tär/-trä*, Tocharian A *-cär.*[17] These endings are certainly the respective preterit = imperative endings TB *-t*, TA *-c* with the ubiquitous *-r* of the middle

---

[17] There does not seem to exist a variant TA †-*crä*, cf. TG, 326, § 411.

present/subjunctive endings added. As for the further etymology, see the overview in VW II/2, 277. The easiest way to account for the difference with respect to palatalization would be to assume that in pre-Tocharian B, a PT ending *-t'ä became secondarily depalatalized under the analogical influence of the many other middle endings starting with, or at least consisting of, a non-palatal (*)-t-. As for that PT *-t'ä, one would like to derive it from the PIE middle ending of the 2.pl. that evidently started with a *-dʰ- which was possibly followed by a *-u̯- (as has been done by Cowgill, 1974, 559 = 2006, 39 and Jasanoff, 1977, 160), and not from the 2.pl. active ending PIE *-te/*-tē, as has also been done before (but note that according to Jasanoff, 2003, 48 the *-dʰ- of the middle ending was analogically replaced by *-t- in both Anatolian and Tocharian). Pinault, 1989, 156 and 2008, 624 derived TB *-tä from a Sievers variant *-dʰuu̯e > *PT *-täw'ä > pre-TB *-täyä, which seems to require irregular phonological development; as for TA -c, Pinault in 2008 suggested analogical influence from the 2.pl. active ending of the present/subjunctive ending set (somewhat differently, Pinault in 1989 derived TA -c from a middle ending *-dʰe lacking *-u̯-; see on Pinault, 1989 also Cavoto, 2004, 246f.).

3.2.2.6.   3.pl. middle

TB/TA -ntär/-nträ has to be seen together with the respective 3. singular -tär/-trä; for possible explanations see above 3.2.2.3.

3.3.   THE ENDINGS OF THE PRETERIT(/IMPERFECT) STEMS

In Tocharian A, with a few exceptions the imperfect uses the ending set of the preterit, while the Tocharian B imperfect has preserved the optative endings, which are basically the ones of the present/ subjunctive ending set (with the general exception of the 3.sg. active). The synchronically irregular and rarely attested Class VI preterit (< thematic inflection) is not treated here, but in chap. Pt VI in detail.

Active

	ā-inflection		non-ā-inflection	
	TB	TA	TB	TA
1.sg.	-ăwa	-ā, -āwā	-wa	-wā/-u
2.sg.	-ăsta	-āṣt	-asta	-äṣt
3.sg.	-a	-ø/-ā-ṃ	-sa	-äs/-sā-m
1.pl.	-ăm	-āmäs	-am	-mäs
2.pl.	-ăs(o)	-ās	-as/-so	—
3.pl.	-ăre	-ār	-ar	-är

Middle

	ā-inflection		non-*ā*-inflection	
	TB	TA	TB	TA
1.sg.	*-ămai*	*-e/-āwe*	*-mai*	*-e/-we*
2.sg.	*-ătai*	*-āte*	*-tai*	*-te*
3.sg.	*-ăte*	*-āt*	*-te*	*-t*
1.pl.	*-ăm(n)te*	*-āmät*	*-m(n)te*	*-mät*
2.pl.	*-at*	*-āc*	—	*-c*
3.pl.	*-ănte*	*-ānt*	*-nte*	*-nt*

3.3.1. *Active*

3.3.1.1. *1.sg. active*

Especially in Tocharian A different variants are attested:

	TB	TA
Pt I	*-āwa*	*-ā*
Pt II	*-awa*	*-āwā/-ā*
Pt III	*-wa/-uwa*	*-wā/-u*
Pt IV	*-ăwa*	*-āwā*
Pt V	*-āwa*	*-ā*
Imp		*-āwā/-ā*

Krause, 1955a, 138 claims that the "regellos" variation of active TA *-ā* and TA *-āwā* (and middle TA *-e* and TA *-āwe*) to be found in the TA imperfect[18] is due to the fact that the formation of the imperfect from the present stem is an innovation; similarly Winter, 1965a, 206f. = 1984, 173f. = 2005, 132f. As a general rule, Winter, l.c., states that TA *-ā* turns up with *ā*-stems, TA *-wā* with consonantal stems, and exceptions from that basic rule such as the 1.sg. Pt II TA *śaśmāwā-m* or the 1.sg. Pt IV TA *laläkṣāwā* are to be explained analogically, viz. by assuming a regular contraction of *-āwā to TA *-ā*, onto which *-wā* (which was itself an innovated allomorph; see below) was again added. Winter, 1991, 54 = 2005, 431; 1994, 404 = 2005, 453 has further

---

[18] To be sure, we have just one instance of the active ending TA *-ā* (TA *spārtwṣā*) vs. three certain attestations of TA *-āwā* (TA *ṣmāwā, koṣāwā, klyosäṃṣāwā*); in the middle, we have one single attestation of TA *-e* (TA *wläṃṣe*) vs. two of TA *-āwe* (TA *mäncāwe, wläṃṣāwe*); note that the variants TA *wläṃṣe* and TA *wläṃṣāwe* are even attested in the very same manuscript.

shown that the lack of vowel weakening by vowel balance in forms such as the 1.sg. Pt I TA *tākā* 'I was' is due to the former disyllabic structure of the ending *-ā* < *-āwā*. For the assumption of a contraction, see already Couvreur, 1947a, 56, § 95, and the ref. by Van Windekens in VW II/2, 280 (who, however, rejects it), and also Þórhalsdóttir, 1988, 201.

In Tocharian B, we have an ending variant *-uwa* in the 1.sg.act. Pt III, as was seen by Schmidt, 1985, 433f., who assumed that this is "the older variant", even though it is just attested in texts that show influence of the informal styles; however, that does not necessarily speak against the assumption of an archaism, see chap.s Sound Laws 1.3. and Pt III 9.1.1. There it will become clear that the suggestion by G. Schmidt, 1985, 59, fn. 31 of a "falsche Neuauflage von Sievers' Gesetz?" is unfounded.

As for the Pt III ending in Tocharian A, TA *-wā* is, of course, not the regular outcome of PT *-äwā, but an analogical form,[19] whereas the expected ending TA *-u* is also attested, as was shown by Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 52ff. = Winter, 2005, 436ff. Note that most examples of TA *-u* are either morphologically irregular in some other aspects as well (see chap. Pt III for the details), or are forms of high frequency such as TA *campu* 'I was able' attested beside 1.sg. TA *camwā*, i.e., it seems that the more archaic ending was precisely preserved in frequent forms or in forms detached from the average Pt III stem formation.

The *w*-element of the Tocharian ending is generally connected with the u-element showing up in some perfect forms from other branches, as first done by Meillet, 1930, 183 = 1977, 266; see the ref. in VW II/2, 280 and the lengthy discussion by G. Schmidt, 1985, 53ff. G. Schmidt adheres to the explanation of that *-u̯- as a deictic element, whereas Winter, 1965a, 209 = 1984, 175f. = 2005, 134 believes in a glide *-u̯- developing between root-final *-ō from *-oH and the endings of the 1.sg. *-h$_2$e and the 3.sg. *-e in perfects made from roots in *-eH; similarly Hackstein, 2002a, 229f., fn. 71. Differently, Jasanoff, 1988, 66 rather derives PT *-wā directly from a *-h$_2$u he says could have resulted from the familiar 1.sg. ending *-h$_2$e by sound law in certain contexts (hereby followed by Pinault, 1989, 157f.); cf. now also

---

[19] Winter rightly claimed that TA *-wā* could have been triggered by an analogical proportion *-e* : *-we* :: *-ā* : x, x = *-wā*. G. Schmidt, 1985, 60 was quite wrong arguing that it is rather the middle ending TA *-we* that was analogically created; see below 3.3.2.1.

Jasanoff, 2003, 175f.: *-oH-h$_2$e > *-oHu > *-ōu̯ → *-ōu̯ + *-a eventually "resegmented as *-ō-u̯a". On the other hand, Klingenschmitt, 1994, 407 = 2005, 432 claims that PT *-wā is an inner-Tocharian creation based on the analogical proportion 2.sg. Prs *-tä : 1.sg. Prs *-μä :: 2.sg. Pt *-tā : x, x = 1.sg. Pt *-μā.

But if it is correct that pre-PT *-m- could finally turn into PT *-w- within verbal endings just by (more or less irregular) sound change, one may, of course, feel free to derive PT *-wā from a Middle I = Middle II ending *-m-h$_2$e of the Greek -μαι and -μᾱν type. Note that most of the other Tocharian active Pt endings clearly derive from the Middle II/perfect ending set, with the 3.pl. ending pre-PT *-ro by its *-o clearly looking like a middle ending rather than like an (active) perfect ending (see above all Ringe, 1990, 199f.; Jasanoff, 2003, 32f., 51ff.; Tremblay, 2006, esp. 267). Note furthermore that some archaic-looking Pt III forms of Tocharian A show the zero grade of the root precisely in the singular active — of course within athematic paradigms, one should expect the zero grade of a root/stem to show up only in singular active forms of a middle paradigm (see chap. Pt III 9.1.4).

3.3.1.2.   *2.sg. active*

TA -*ṣt* and TB -*sta* go back to PT *-stā, which was as early as Petersen, 1933, 28f. compared with the Hittite 2.sg. preterit ending -*išta* (and the Latin 2.sg. perfect -*istī*), see the ref. in VW II/2, 281 and for a detailed list of possible comparanda from other branches G. Schmidt, 1985, 84ff. To be sure, Hitt. -*išta* has been claimed to be an inner-Anatolian creation, see now Jasanoff, 2003, 119 and Kloekhorst, 2008, 802 (each with a different scenario). It is generally assumed that PT *-stā is ultimately based on PIE *-th$_2$a. Krause, 1951, 152ff. assumed a cross between *-th$_2$a and "die alte Sekundärendung -*s* des Aorists", followed by TEB I, § 462 and Pinault, 1989, 158. Ringe, 1990, 209f. and Klingenschmitt, 1994, 409 = 2005, 434 both seem to derive the *-s- of this ending from a (classical) sigmatic aorist, although not very explicitly. Again differently, Jasanoff, 2003, 176 assumes that the -*s*- was owed to the PIE sound law *-TT- > -TsT-, i.e., originated in roots ending in a dental.

3.3.1.3.   *3.sg. active*

The 3.sg. of the *ā*-preterit inflection has what seems to be a zero ending, i.e., mere stem-final (*)-*ā* in both languages; a similar zero

ending appears in the 3.sg. optative/imperfect in Tocharian B, and only in the latter case we can be sure that the zero ending derives from PIE *-t. In the Class III *s*-preterit, on the other hand, we have TB -*sa* and TA -*äs*/-*sā*-+*clitic*, which is to be derived from PT *-sā.[20] It is obvious that the final *-ā was not original here, see chap. Pt III in detail.

3.3.1.4.   *1.pl. active*

The 1.pl. active endings of the preterit are the same as the ones of the respective endings of the present/subjunctive in both languages; note, however, that the two languages have two different endings. The only (slight) difference between preterit and present/subjunctive is that in the TB preterit no variants with *o* mobile are attested, though it is difficult to judge whether this is just due to coincidence or not. To be sure, the TB accent as in the 1.pl.act. Pt I *karpām* still attests to a former trisyllabic form **kārpä́mä*.

3.3.1.5.   *2.pl. active*

The ending of the 2.pl. active of both languages was *-s- followed by a vowel that had various different outcomes: pre-TB *-ä, TA zero, but also TB -*o* and TA -*u*, see below 3.4.1.2. and 3.4.2.1. on the Ipv. The imperatives of the 2.pl. have in general the same endings as the respective Pt forms, but it is remarkable that in the 2.pl. of the active imperative of Tocharian B, the variant with final -*o* is not confined at all to the usual *o*-mobile contexts, i.e., metrical passages, and that this only holds to a lesser degree for the respective preterit variant. The 2.pl.act. Pt I *klyauṣāso* 'you heard' is attested in pāda-final position, i.e., in a regular *o*-mobile position, whereas *lyakāso* 'you saw (?)' in H 149.add 134 (= IOL Toch 178) b 8 is attested sentence-initially in what looks like a prose passage, but it cannot be excluded that the form is an imperative instead of a preterit in the first place. The second attestation of the latter form in 625 a 6 is without context. On the other hand, three 2.pl.act. Pt I forms are attested without final *o* (though with the accent on the -*ā*- attesting to a former trisyllabic structure: *cämpyās*, *takās*, *srukās*). There is no respective 2.pl.act. attested in the TB preterit of Class II, while the *s*-preterit has once a form *maitas* (=

---

[20] To be more precise, PT *-sā after vowels and PT *-äsā after non-syllabics, as shown by Winter, 1994, 406 = 2005, 455 (see in detail chap. Pt III 9.1.1.). Consequently, the speculations by Levet, 1991, 163ff. do now lack their basis.

maitā́s) 'you set out' and once a form *lautso* 'you removed', and *lautso* comes from a prose passage (431 b 2, MQ); in the preterit Class IV one can restore a 2.pl.act. *yāmṣa(so)* 'you made' in a metrical passage (42 a 3; colon-final); the Pt V 2.pl.act. *wñās* 'you said' also comes from a metrical passage (12 b 4), and the same is true for the Pt VI *latso* 'you went out' (colon-internal).

Note that there is a difference in Tocharian A between the Pt I where we find TA *-ās* and TA *-as* with regular weakening by vowel balance as in TA *kotas*, and the corresponding Ipv I where we have TA *-äs*.

As for the origin of PT *-sV, a number of analogical explanations and connections with otherwise not so clear material from other branches has been put forward, see the older literature in VW II/2, 283ff.; for the latter strategy see also Adams, 1993a, 29ff., who compared the 2.pl. perfect future Osc.-U. *-uso*, and the speculation by G. Schmidt, 1995, 91, fn. 157 about a "numerusindifferentes Zeichen idg. *-s-* der 2. Person". Klingenschmitt, 1994, 410 = 2005, 435 assumes that *-sV goes back to *-s-e ("Unterbleiben der Palatalisierung analogisch nach *-stā < *-sth₂a"), *-s-e being a combination of the original PIE 2.pl.act. perfect ending and the *s*-aorist suffix; see also Petersen, 1933, 28; Cavoto, 2004, 245f.; Pinault, 2008, 627. Again differently, Peters, 2004, 438, fn. 40 starts with *-so assuming the same kind of reduction *æ > *ä in posttonic syllables as he says is found in the endings of the 3.sg./pl.mid. present (see above), and the 3.pl.act. preterit (see below). Recently, Kloekhorst, 2008a, 498 has connected the *s*-element with that of Hitt. 2.pl. Prs *-šteni*, Pt *-šten* claiming it to have been originally restricted to the *ḫi*-conjugation. See further the diachronic discussion in chap. Ipv 37.8., where the ending will be derived from pre-PT *-sas.

3.3.1.6. *3.pl. active*

In the TB Class I preterit and preterit classes that inflect like the Class I preterit we have TB *-āre* (respectively *-are* when the accent is on the root syllable), whereas in the Class III preterit we find *-ar* (always bearing the accent), and *-är* in MQ-character texts. On the other hand, the Class III ending can secondarily acquire a final *-e*, while the *ā*-ending *-āre*, respectively *-are*, can lose the final *-e.* As is argued in detail in the respective chapters on the preterit stem classes (see also Peyrot, 2008, 132ff.), Pt III *-are* seems to be a feature of the informal /eastern variety of Tocharian B. On the other hand, loss of final *-e* is especially often attested before a following clitic (not confined to

informal/eastern texts): we have attestations from Classes I, IV, and V for this case, e.g., the 3.pl. Pt V *weñāre-neś* (S) beside *weñār-mes* (S). However, loss of final *-e* is also attested without following clitic in 3.pl. Pt I forms, and the latter instances seem to be confined to informal/eastern documents, so that one will no doubt assume loss as a result of weakening or even apocope for these phonologically more progressive varieties. The fact that the informal styles could lose the final *-e* in the Pt I ending may then also ultimately be the reason for introducing *-e* into the 3.pl. ending of the Class III preterit, i.e., this may be another case of hypercorrection.[21]

Tocharian A shows *-ār* in Classes I, II, and V, but *-är* in Class III, so that one can set up PT *-āræ as ending of the *ā*-classes and PT *-ärä with final *ä (as per Winter, 1989, 114ff. and Ringe, 1990, 197f.) for Pt III.

As for the etymology of PT *-āræ and PT *-ärä, Ringe, 1990, 197ff. rightly pointed out the problems met with the traditional explanations referred to in VW II/2, 285f. Since pre-PT *-ro would look like a middle and not like a perfect ending, and since pre-PT *-re/*-ri/*-ru would hardly lead anywhere, he followed Cowgill's suggestion (p.c.) that PT *-ræ derived from pre-PT *-ront, and PT *-rä from pre-PT *-rn̥t, with zero-grade variant *-rn̥t reflecting the origin of Pt III in an acrostatic paradigm (i.e., the classical *s*-aorist); a bit differently Pinault, 2008, 627f.; see the discussion above 3.1.1.6. According to Peters, 2004, 436, fn. 35 and 438, fn. 40, *-ärä can be derived from unaccented PIE *-ro with *o showing the same posttonic weakening to *ä that can also be assumed for the 3.sg./pl.mid. Prs/Sub *-(n)tär* (see above), whereas 3.pl. Pt I *-āre* he says can be derived from an accented variant *-ró.

3.3.2. *Middle*

3.3.2.1.   *1.sg. middle*

The endings of the 1.sg. middle at first glance seem to differ quite considerably in the two languages. Tocharian B has *-mai* and Tocharian A has the variants *-e* and *-we*, the latter being confined to TA Pt 0 *yāmwe* and the imperfect where *-āwe* has to be as secondary as the respective active ending *-āwā*; see above 3.3.1.1. The resemblance of TB *-mai* to Gk. -μαι is, of course, striking at first glance (see, e.g., TEB I, 260, § 468,2 and the ref. in VW II/2, 289f.), but Lane,

---

[21] The 3.pl. forms *prautkar* and *rotkär-ne* are again to be explained differently; see the discussion in chap. Pt I 7.2.1.1.

1976, 144f. argued that judging by TA -*e* the PT ending had rather been *-āi̯, and that the *m*-element of Tocharian B could have just recently been introduced from the 1.sg. present ending *-mi. As a matter of fact, pace Pinault, 2008, 629 the distribution of the two TA endings (-*e* only found with stems ending in -*ā*-, -*we* found in the archaic Pt 0) clearly points to the conclusion that -*e* is always contracted from pre-TA *-āwāy, and that in pre-TA there had just been one single respective ending, viz. *-wāy (as per Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 55 and most recently Cavoto, 2004, 236f.), which is an almost perfect match for TB -*mai*, since in Tocharian A, *-m- could have easily be replaced by *-w- either as a result of sound change or under the analogical influence of the *-w- found in the respective active ending. There is another problem with PT *-māy, because one does not expect final *-y in a preterit ending and no final *-y in any middle ending of a branch that had otherwise clearly -*r* as a marker of primary middle endings in use. Of course, the same problem is met in the 2.sg.mid. ending TB -*tai*, TA -*te* < PT *-tāy, which looks like the PIE Middle II/perfect ending of the 2.sg. *-th₂a + the primary ending marker *-i. According to Jasanoff, 1977, 169, Tocharian could use pre-PT *-mai̯ and *-tai̯ as preterit endings precisely because in the present/ subjunctive of the middle Tocharian made regularly use of the *-r in order to mark the endings as primary ones, so that the old primary endings in *-ai̯ became free to carry other functions and eventually became "confined to non-present function". Pinault, 2008, 629f. objects to this explanation and suggests we have to start with a post-PIE ending *-(H)aHam, which according to him would have led first to *-aHan, then to *-ān, and eventually to "*-*ai*". But note that according to Schumacher, 2007, 274, the 3.pl. ending of the Old Albanian aorist is to be derived from a primary middle ending PIE *-ntoi̯, which would furnish an almost perfect parallel, and that Phrygian is said to have 3.sg. preterit forms in -*toy*, such as *edatoy* (see most recently Brixhe, 2004, 53f.). Of course, for all these languages one may assume that they once had a middle perfect with primary endings in *-i̯, and that still in prehistorical times the middle perfect had fused with the aorist.

3.3.2.2. *2.sg. middle*

TB -*tai* and TA -*te* apparently go back to PT *-tāy, which seems to consist of *-tā < PIE 2.sg. *-th₂a and of the same problematic "primary" marker *-i that is also attested in the 1.sg.mid. preterit *-māy, see the discussion above. Whatever the correct explanation for *-māy is, one

can always make the claim for Toch. 2.sg. middle endings starting with *-t-* that they were creations ex nihilo ultimately based on the 2.sg. active Prs/Sub ending *-tä; see above 3.2.2.2.

3.3.2.3.   *3.sg. middle*

TB *-te*, TA *-t* < PT *-tæ clearly go back to the regular PIE secondary ending of Middle I *-to (see the ref. in VW II/2, 291).

3.3.2.4.   *1.pl. middle*

TB *-mät* and TA *-mät* most likely go back to PIE *-medʰh$_2$ > *-mätā, with the final *-ā replaced by *-æ under the analogical influence of the 3.sg. and 3.pl., hence *-mätæ; cf. VW II/2, 291f. and Pinault, 1989, 159f.; 2008, 629. On the TB ending variant *-mnte* (not †*-mtte*) see above sub 1.pl.mid. of the Prs/Sub and Peyrot, 2008, 155ff.

3.3.2.5.   *2.pl. middle*

For the 2.pl. middle see above 3.2.2.5.

3.3.2.6.   *3.pl. middle*

TB *-nte* and TA *-nt* clearly go back to PT *-ntæ, which can neatly be derived from the regular PIE ending of Middle I *-nto (see the ref. in VW II/2, 293f.).

3.4.   THE ENDINGS OF THE IMPERATIVE STEMS

The *e*-imperative forms and the synchronically irregular Class VII as well as the paradigms of the Class IV and V imperative forms are discussed in detail in chap. Ipv and not in this one.

	TB Class I	TA	TB Class II	TA	TB Class III	TA
2.sg.act.	*-a*	*-ø*, *-ø-ñi*	*-a*, *-ø*	*-ø*, *-ā-ñi*	*-ø*, *-sa*	*-ø*, *-ā-m*
2.pl.act.	*-as(o)*	*-äs*	*-as(o)*	*-äs*	*-so*	*-äs*
2.sg.mid.	*-ar*	*-ār*	*-ar*	*-ār*	*-sar*	*-sār*
2.pl.mid.	*-at*	*-āc*	*-at*	*-āc*	*-sat*	*-sāc*

3.4.1. *Active*

3.4.1.1. *2.sg. active*

The ending of the 2.sg. active of the Class I and II imperative in Tocharian B is (*)-*ā*, i.e., what looks like the mere stem with a zero ending. This tallies with the fact that in the imperative it is the 2. person that is the unmarked one (see, e.g., Watkins, 1969, 119f. with ref.). This (*)-*ā* is once lost in a Class II Ipv (*päccauk* 'hide!'), which is certainly an informal-style variant. On the other hand, the 2.sg. active of the Class III imperative is usually endingless with the one seeming exception of *peṅksa*, which I will argue in chap. Ipv 37.3. is to be taken for a truncated middle form in *-*sār*. Another irregular endingless 2.sg. Class I imperative form is TA *päṣtāk-ñi* 'be!', which lacks the stem-final -*ā*- one should have expected to be preserved. But since we are no doubt dealing with a form of high frequency, irregular truncation (as actually also met in other forms of the paradigm) can be assumed with some certainty.

3.4.1.2. *2.pl. active*

The plural forms of the Tocharian imperative in general seem to show the same endings as the respective preterit forms. However, the 2.pl. active of the TB imperative often ends in -*o* even in prose texts, i.e., in contexts where *o* mobile does usually not show up at all. This is especially true for the Class III Ipv, for which indeed only forms ending in -*so* are attested. Only one single such prose form ending in -*o* can be adduced for the respective preterit, so it seems that the occurrence of -*o* was rather original with the imperative, from where it may have spread into the preterit. Tocharian A also has a peculiarity in showing TA -*äs* instead of expected -*ās* in the Class I imperative.

3.4.2. *Middle*

3.4.2.1. *2.sg. middle*

The 2.sg. middle ending in both languages can be derived from PT *-*ār*, which looks like the final *-*ā*- of most of the respective active forms with the "middle" marker -*r* attached (see Pinault, 1989, 162).

It is usually claimed that the PIE 2.sg.mid. imperative ending *-*su̯o* is reflected by the one single TA form *päklyossū* (cf. the ref. in VW II/2, 296), but see the objections by Pinault, 2005, 515ff., who rather connects 2.pl. TA *päklyossū* with the TB variant 2.pl. *pklyausso*

attested in a prose text from Sängim, i.e., written in the eastern variety of Tocharian B close to Tocharian A. Both forms show assimilation of *päklyauṣäs° to *-säs-, and as for the final TA *-u*, Pinault refers to the particle TA *nu* 'now', which is also the equivalent of a TB form in *-o*, viz. TB *no* 'id.'.

3.4.2.2. *2.pl. middle*

The 2.pl.mid. endings of the imperative are in general the same as the 2.pl.mid. endings of the respective preterit paradigms.

3.5. THE DUAL ENDINGS

	2.du.	3.du.act.	3.du.mid.
TB Prs	—	*-teṃ*	*-aitär*
		Prs I+II *nesteṃ* 'both are';	Prs II *tasaitär*
		Prs IXa *westeṃ* 'both say'	'both resemble'
TB Pt	—	*-ais*	—
		Pt I *stāmais* 'both stopped';	
		Pt VI *ltais* 'both went out'	
TA Pt	—	TA *-enes*	—
		Pt I *taken(e)s* 'both were'	
TB Ipv	*-ait*	—	—
	Ipv III *pyamttsait* 'make!'		
TA Ipv	TA *-es*	—	—
	Ipv VI *pines* 'go!'		

On the dual endings see the different treatments by Hackstein, 1993b, 47ff. and Klingenschmitt, 1994, 411 = 2005, 435. On the imperative dual see also Pinault, 2005, 503ff.; according to Pinault, one has to restore to TA *taken(e)s* in A 354 a 6 and not to TA *taken[a]s* as is generally assumed. The form he says was based on **takes* < **takai̯s*, and acquired the nasal in analogy with 2.du. Ipv TA *pines* 'go!'.

The dual is apparently characterized by a morpheme PT *-āy- (> -ai-/ TA *-e-*) being supplied with secondary endings.

3.6.   THE NON-FINITE FORMS

3.6.1. *Gerundive*

The gerundive in *-lle*, TA *-l* is to be derived from a modal PIE verbal adjective in *-li̯o- also met in the Armenian verbal adjectives in *-li*;[22] see Hackstein, 2003a, 54 with fn. 4., 59ff., and 2004, 99ff.

3.6.2. *Privative*

The privative in TB *-tte* is rather not to be derived from *-tu̯o-, but from *-to-, as per Hilmarsson, 1991, 15f. with ref. The gemination is no doubt secondary and based on the lautgesetzlich gemination in the other case forms having *-cc-*. Pedersen, 1941, 218 seems to toy with the idea of spontaneous gemination ("in mehrsilbigen Wörtern"), but such a phenomenon is otherwise only met in completely different contexts. The privative was treated in detail by Hilmarsson, 1991. Since the privative is derived from the subjunctive stem of any given verb, I discuss it in the chapter about subjunctives (chap. 17.), and list the respective forms under the subjunctive stem in the verbal index.

3.6.3. *Infinitive*

The infinitive suffix in both languages is *-tsi*, no doubt from PT *-tyæy, which may have to do either with PIE *-dʰi̯ōi̯ (said to underlie Ved. *-dhyai*), as per VW II/2, 250 and Jasanoff apud Ringe, 1996, 79, or is somehow based on a respective case form of a *ti-* or rather *ti̯o*-stem (see Ringe, l.c., with ref.).

---

[22] See Olsen, 1999, 395 with ref.

VALENCY

4.1. Grundverb, Antigrundverb, and Kausativum

The manuals TG, WTG, and TEB agree that numerous Tocharian verbal roots have two or even three different paradigms and call these "Grundverb" and "Kausativum" (paradigms) respectively. TEB I, 174, § 297 differentiates between "Kausativa" standing beside transitive "Grundverben" and such standing beside intransitive "Grundverben", and admitts that in the latter cases the semantic relation "erscheint [...] häufig wie das von Intransitiv/Passiv zu Transitiv/Aktiv", which means that the "Kausativum" often functions as what Jasanoff, 2003, 195 calls "oppositional transitive" and must be kept distinct from the concept of "causative".[1] Much in the same vein, Lane, 1953, 485 points out that the "Kausativum" often is simply what Jasanoff calls an oppositional transitive paradigm, and this was later shown in detail by Winter 1980, 421ff. = 2005, 203ff. and Hackstein, 1995, passim.

Winter, 1962a, 25f. = 1984, 267f. = 2005, 55f.; 1990b, 2535ff. = 2005, 415ff. was also the first to point out that some stem formations from "Kausativum" paradigms are morphologically less complex than the respective stem formations from the "Grundverb" paradigms, see also, e.g., Schmidt, 2000, 234 — so that the term "Grundverb" is in many cases not appropriate either.

Finally, quite a few of those additional paradigms do not even denote oppositional transitives (two of them are even as intransitive as the "Grundverb"; see 4.11. below). For these reasons, I will refrain from referring to those so-called "Kausativa" as causatives[2] (except if they are true causatives with respect to function). I will adhere to the

---

[1] For an exact definition of how I will use these terms, see below 4.3. Carling, 2009, 54ff. distinguishes "(1) Verbs that alternate between intransitives and transitives (causatives), (2) Verbs that alternate between transitive and ditransitive (or intransitive and ditranstive), (3) Verbs that keep their transitivity".

[2] As has been done by other authors writing in English such as Adams and Hilmarsson.

traditional, German terms *grundverb* and *kausativum*, because they are so widely in use, and after all, most of these additional paradigms function as true causatives or at least as oppositional transitives indeed, so that the term *kausativum* is not completely inappropriate in the vast majority of the cases.

Bearing in mind all these facts, I thought the strategy least confusing would be to use both of the terms *grundverb* and *kausativum* essentially in the same way as TG, WTG, and TEB do, that is, as purely morphological terms, so that labeling a paradigm *kausativum* would not automatically imply that the respective paradigm indeed functioned as a causative. However, for clarity's sake I nevertheless decided to restrict *kausativum* to those extremely common additional paradigms that were basically characterized by Class IX(a or b) presents in Tocharian B and Class II/Class IV preterits in both Tocharian A and B, and to coin a new morphological term *antigrundverb* (which has a quite obvious etymology) in order to unambiguously denote those not so common cases of additional paradigms that were basically characterized by Class VIII presents and Class III preterits in both Tocharian A and B.

For the semantic and distributional properties of the antigrundverb paradigms, see below 4.5.1.

The basic definition of a kausativum is that it is a second (or third) verbal paradigm showing stem formations that are not those of the antigrundverb, i.e., that do not have an *s*-present of Class VIII,[3] subjunctive of Class I or II (or VII in Tocharian A) or Class III preterit. I further decided to distinguish four different types of kausativa basically defined by the relation of valency found to exist between the kausativum and its grundverb.

4.1.1. *Kausativum I*

A Kausativum I is a second, transitive kausativum paradigm standing beside an intransitive (unaccusative or unergative)[4] grundverb paradigm and functioning as an oppositional transitive or true causative to the intransitive grundverb, such as:

---

[3] Note that since in Tocharian A *s*- and *sk*-presents have fallen together into one single *s*-present (Class VIII), it is sometimes impossible to distinguish antigrundverb and kausativum paradigms in Tocharian A.

[4] Since the distinction between unaccusative and unergative verbs in Tocharian would require a study of its own, I refrain from a more detailed analysis in this book. On the terms see 4.3. below.

klautk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'turn, become' (itr) with Prs IV, Sub V, Pt I, Ipv I vs. Kaus. I 'make turn' (tr) with Prs IXb, Sub IXb, Ipv IV.

The following verbs form a Kausativum I:

ān⁽ᵃ⁾-sk- Gv. 'breathe in, inhale', K 'make breathe', *ᴬoks-* Gv. 'grow, increase', K 'make grow', *kātk-/* *ᴬkātk-* Gv. 'rejoice, be glad', K 'make glad', *kārp⁽ᵃ⁾-/* *ᴬkārp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'descend', K 'make descend; pass on', *kän⁽ᵃ⁾-/* *ᴬkän-* Gv. 'come about, occur, be fulfilled', K 'fulfill (a wish)', *ᴬkäln-* Gv. 'resound', K 'let resound', *kery-* Gv. 'laugh', K 'make laugh', *klāw⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be called, named', K 'name, announce', *ᴬklisᵃ-* Gv. 'sleep', K 'make sleep', *klutk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'turn, become', K 'make, turn into', *klautk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'turn, become', K 'make turn', *täm-/* *ᴬtäm-* Gv. 'be born, come into being', K 'beget, generate', *tuk⁽ᵃ⁾-(/ ᴬtpuk⁽ᵃ⁾-)* Gv. 'hide oneself, seek refuge in', K 'hide (something)', *triw⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬtriw⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be mixed, shaken', K 'mix, shake (something)', *ᴬtrisk-* Gv. 'sound, boom', K 'let boom', *ᴬtränk-* Gv. 'cling, stick', K 'cling, affix to', *twās⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'shine', K 'kindle', *nān⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'appear', K 'show', *nāsk-* Gv. 'bathe, swim', K 'bathe sb.', *ᴬnätsw⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'starve', K 'let starve', *nitt⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'collapse', K 'tear down', *naut⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬnut⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'disappear', K 'make disappear, destroy', *pārāk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'prosper', K 'make prosper', *pärsk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬpärsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be afraid', K 'frighten', *pälk-/ ᴬpälk-* Gv. 'shine', K 'illuminate, show', *ᴬpyāṣt⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be strong, be nourished', K 'make grow', *pränk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬpränk?-* Gv. 'restrain oneself, keep away', K 'reject', *prutk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬprutk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be shut; be filled', K 'shut; fill up', *plānt⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬplānt⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'rejoice, be glad', K 'make glad', *plu-* Gv. 'float, fly, soar', K 'let fly, soar', *ᴬplutk-* Gv. '± (a)rise', K '± protrude, let flow out', *ᴬmāsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be difficult, present problems', K '?', *mäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'run', K 'make run', *mänk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬmänk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be inferior, lack, be deprived of', K 'overcome', *mit⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'set out, go, come', K 'let go', *miw⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'tremble, quake', K 'shake', *mauk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'refrain from, desist', K '?', *mrausk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬmrosk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'feel disgust, aversion to the world', K 'make someone feel disgust', *yānk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬyānk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be deluded', K 'bewitch', *yās⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be excited', K 'excite sb.', *yät⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be decorated', K 'adorn, decorate', *yäp-* Gv. 'enter; set (sun)', K 'let enter', *ᴬyär⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'bathe; purge (ritually)', K 'bathe sb.', *ritt⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬritw⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be attached, linked to, persist; be suitable', K 'connect, adapt, translate', *lāl-* Gv. 'exert oneself, get tired,', K '± make tired', *län-t-* Gv. 'go out, emerge', K 'let go out', *läm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'sit', K 'set, let subside'/ *ᴬläm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'sit', K 'set, make sit down', *wārwᵃ?-/ ᴬwārpᵃ?-* Gv. 'prod, urge oneself', K 'spur on, prod (something), urge sb.', *wāsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'stir, move, quake', K 'move away (something)'/ *ᴬwāsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'move, quake', K 'stir up, let shake', *wäks⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. '± turn away', K '± make turn away', *ᴬwäs-* Gv. 'don, wear (clothes)', K 'dress sb.', *waiw⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬwip⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be wet', K 'moisten', *ᴬsätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'spread out', K 'spread (something)', *ᴬsälpᵃ-* Gv. 'glow', K 'make glow', *si-n-* Gv. mid. 'satiate oneself; be depressed', K act. 'satiate', mid. 'get depressed', *suk?-* Gv. 'hang down; hesitate', K 'let linger/hesitate', *swās⁽ᵃ⁾-/ᴬswās⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv.

'rain', K 'let rain', *soy-* Gv. 'become sated, satisfied', K 'satiate', *stäm*^(a)-/ ^A*ṣtäm*^(a)- Gv. 'stand', K 'put, place', *stin*^ä-*sk-* Gv. 'be silent', K 'make silent', *staukk*^(a)- Gv. 'swell', K 'make swell', *spārtt*^(a)-/ ^A*spārtw*^(a)- Gv. 'turn; behave; be', K 'turn (something)', *spāw*^(a)- Gv. 'subside, diminish', K 'reduce', *spänt*^(a)- Gv. 'trust', K 'make trust', *swār*^(a)- Gv. 'please', K 'enjoy', *tsārw*^(a)-/ ^A*tsārw*^(a)- Gv. 'be comforted, take heart', K 'comfort, console', ^A*tsäm*^(a)- Gv. 'grow, increase, come into being', K 'increase, cause to grow', *tsär*^(a)-/ ^A*tsär*^(a)- Gv. 'be separated', K 'separate', *tsälp*^(a)-/ ^A*tsälp*^(a)- Gv. 'pass away, be released, redeemed', K 'redeem, free', *tsuw*^(a)- Gv, 'attach oneself, being stuck together, stick to', K 'add'/ ^A*tsuw*^(a)- Gv. act. 'stick together', mid. 'obey', K 'put together'.

4.1.2. *Kausativum II*

A Kausativum II is a third, kausativum paradigm (which is always transitive) standing beside both a grundverb paradigm (which is always intransitive) and an antigrundverb, such as:

wätk^(a)- 'decide', 'be decided', 'differ' (itr) with Sub V, Pt I vs.
Antigv. 'separate', 'decide' (tr) with Sub I+II, Pt III vs.
Kaus. II 'command' (tr) with Prs IXb, Sub IXb, Pt II.

The following verbs form a Kausativum II:
ār^(a)-/ ^A*ār*^(a)- Gv. 'cease, come to an end', Antigv. 'leave, give up, abandon' (tr), K 'give up, abandon', *āl*^(a)- Gv. '± be restrained', Antigv. 'keep away, hold in check' (tr), K 'keep away, hold in check', *ās*^(a)- Gv. 'dry (out)', Antigv. 'dry (out)' (itr), K 'make dry', *aiw*^(a)- Gv. 'be turned toward, incline to', Antigv. 'turn to' (tr), K 'turn to', *trik*^(a)- Gv. 'go astray, be confused', Antigv. 'miss, fail', 'go astray, stumble', 'lead astray' (tr/itr), K act. 'lead astray', mid. 'faint'/ ^A*trik*^(a)- Gv. 'be confused; faint', Antigv. 'fail, miss', 'be confused', 'confuse, lead astray' (tr/itr), K 'sin against sb.', *musk*^(a)- Gv. 'disappear, perish', Antigv. 'make subside' (tr), K 'make subside', *yāt*^(a)- Gv. 'be (cap)able', Antigv. 'tame', K 'enable, tame', *läṅk-*/ ^A*läṅk-* Gv. 'hang, dangle', Antigv. act. 'hang up', mid. 'be attached to', K 'let dangle', ^A*luk-* Gv. 'light up, be illuminated', Antigv. 'illuminate' (tr), K 'illuminate', *wāk*^(a)- Gv. 'split apart, bloom', Antigv. mid. 'differ' (cf. ^A*wāk*^(a)- Antigv. act. 'take apart, split apart', mid. 'differ' (tr/itr)), K 'let bloom', *wätk*^(a)-/ ^A*wätk*^(a)- Gv. 'decide', 'be decided', 'differ', Antigv. 'separate', 'decide' (tr), K 'command', *wik*^(a)-/ ^A*wik*^(a)- Gv. 'disappear', Antigv. 'avoid' (tr), K 'drive away, remove', *sāk*^(a)- Gv. 'remain over, remain behind', Antigv. mid. 'be left, restrain oneself' (itr), K 'restrain, leave behind', *sätk*^(a)- Gv. 'spread out', Antigv. 'spread (something)', K 'spread (something)', *säl*^(a)-(/ ^A*säl*^(a)-) Gv. 'fly, arise', Antigv. 'throw (down)' (tr), K 'throw (down)', *spärk*^(a)-/

ᴬspärk⁽ᵃ⁾- Gv. 'disappear, perish', Antigv. 'get lost', 'go astray' (itr), K 'cause to disappear, destroy'.

4.1.3. *Kausativum III*

A Kausativum III is a second, kausativum paradigm standing beside a grundverb paradigm and having the same valency as the grundverb, i.e., it functions neither as an oppositional transitive nor as a causative to the grundverb, and can even be as much intransitive as the grundverb itself, such as:

śāw- 'live' (itr) with Prs II, Sub II, Pt I, Pt VII, Ipv VI vs.
Kaus. III 'live' (itr) with Prs IXa, Pt IV.

The following verbs form a Kausativum III:
ārt(t)⁽ᵃ⁾- Gv. 'be pleased with, love, praise' (tr), K 'acknowledge; rejoice in' (tr), *kärn³-* Gv. 'hit' (tr), K 'inflict pain' (tr), *käln-* Gv. 'resound' (itr), K 'howl, roar (of the wind)' (itr), *krās⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. act. 'vex' (tr), mid. 'be angry' (itr), K act. 'vex' (tr), mid. 'be angry' (itr), *ᴬtā(-s)-* Gv. act. 'put, set, place' (tr), mid. 'place oneself' (itr), K (*ᴬtäs-*) 'provide' (tr), *täl⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬtäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'carry, bear' (tr), K 'lift up, carry' (tr), *näm-* Gv. act. 'bend' (tr), mid. 'bow' (itr), K 'bend' (tr), *nu⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'cry, shout' (tr), K 'shout (a shout)' (tr), *ᴬpärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'sprinkle, spray' (tr), K 'sprinkle, water' (tr), *putk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'divide, separate, distinguish' (tr), K 'divide' (tr), *mälk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. '± put (on) (jewelry, weapons)' (tr), K '± cross (arms)' (tr), *yäs-* Gv. 'excite, touch (sexually)' (tr), K 'touch (sexually)' (tr), *ᴬyu⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'turn, incline towards' (itr), K 'aspire to, reach out for' (itr), *lik⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'wash' (tr; med. tant.), K act. 'wash sb.' (tr), mid. 'wash' (tr), *ᴬlitk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'remove' (tr), K 'remove' (tr), *ᴬwät⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'put, place' (tr), K 'erect, place (upright)' (tr), *śāw-/ ᴬśāw-* Gv. 'live' (itr), K 'live' (itr), *ṣäṃs-* Gv. 'count, count as' (tr), K 'count as' (tr), *ᴬtsäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'pull, take (out, away)' (tr), K 'take away' (tr). Unclear are: *ᴬeṃts⁽ᵃ⁾-* '?' (Kaus. III/IV), *ku-* '?' (Kaus. III/IV), *kutkᵃ³-* '?' (Kaus. III/IV).
For the semantic properties, see the more detailed account below in section 4.11.

4.1.4. *Kausativum IV*

A Kausativum IV is a second, transitive kausativum paradigm standing beside a transitive grundverb paradigm and functioning as a true causative to the transitive grundverb,[5] such as:

---

[5] But note that the Kaus. IV of *kärs⁽ᵃ⁾-/ᴬkärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'know' is sometimes used in a non-causative sense, and then denotes rather 'make known'.

kälp⁽ᵃ⁾- 'obtain' (tr) with Prs IXa, Sub VI, Pt I
Kaus. IV 'make obtain, bestow' with Prs IXb.

The following verbs form a Kausativum IV:
ākl- Gv. 'learn', K 'teach', *au-n-* Gv. act. 'hit, wound', mid. 'begin', K 'cause to begin', *kätk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬkätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cross, pass (time), surpass, trespass, commit (sin)' (tr/itr), K 'let pass, cross', *kärs⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬkärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'know, understand, recognize', K 'make know(n), make recognize, announce, teach', *kälᵃ-* Gv. 'lead, bring', K 'let lead (the way)', *kälp⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬkälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'obtain', K 'cause to obtain, bestow upon', *ᴬkäl(t)sᵃ-* Gv. 'oppress', K 'let be pressed (together)', *käs-/ ᴬkäs-* act. 'quench, extinguish' (tr), mid. 'come to extinction' (itr), K 'let come to extinction', *kau-* Gv. 'destroy, kill', K 'make kill', *kraup⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'gather', 'assemble, congregate', K 'let gather', *ᴬtkälᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'illuminate', K 'illuminate, illustrate', *märs⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'forget', K 'make forget', *yänm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'achieve, reach', K 'make obtain', *rām⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'compare', K 'let compare', *läk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬläk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'see, look', K 'make see, show', *ᴬlut-* Gv. 'remove', K 'let remove', *wāltsᵃ-* Gv. 'grind', K 'let grind', *ᴬwe-ñ-* Gv. 'say, speak', K 'make say', *särk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. '± take care of; pull (?)', K '± let take care of', *ᴬtsit⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'touch', K 'make touch'.
Probably also: *päk-* Gv. act. 'cook, let ripen' (tr), mid. 'cook, ripen' (itr), K 'let cook'.

4.2. VALENCY

The valency of a verb basically concerns the number of arguments it can combine with; formally stated, it is the property of a verb's so-called argument structure. Traditionally, one distinguishes transitive verbs, which take on a direct object (and thereby are bivalent or two-place predicates) and intransitive verbs, which cannot combine with a direct object (and thereby are monovalent or avalent verbs). In this study I basically adhere to this traditional definition. A Tocharian verbal stem is hence transitive if it takes on a direct object, i.e., an obliquus. Modern linguistics, however, reckons with the existence of two very different kinds of intransitive verbs that can be kept distinct both syntactically and semantically, scil. *unaccusative* and *unergative* verbs.[6]

---

[6] According to the so-called Unaccusative Hypothesis originally formulated by Perlmutter, 1978, 157ff. the class of intransitive verbs is not uniform but consists of two subclasses, namely unaccusatives and unergatives, each associated with a different underlying syntactic configuration. In Relational Grammar, the framework adopted by Perlmutter,

4.3.   Causativity, Voice, and Valency in PIE

To judge from the evidence of the most ancient branches of the IE family, with respect to the issues of valency and voice there seem to have existed three different kinds of verbal roots[7] in Late PIE:

(1) Roots denoting processes or states for which it is quite natural to assume external causation on one occasion and no external causation on another, such as PIE *√u̯aĝ 'break (itr/tr)', *√ĝenh₁ 'come/bring into being', *√dʰegʷʰ 'burn (itr/tr)', *√nek̂ 'perish/destroy', *√pekʷ 'cook (itr/tr)', the likes of which constitute a subgroup of unaccusative verbs, which are said to be capable of undergoing the so-called "causative alternation".[8] If a causer of the process/state was expressed ("the thief breaks the window"), active and/or middle forms derived from such verbs were used transitively. In this case, the subject of these forms is the external agent, and the accusative object is the patient or theme of the respective process/state. When no causer was assumed at all or at least mentioned, a middle form was used intransitively (with the subject being the patient or theme of the respective process/state: "the window breaks"). Such intransitive forms can, and will be called in this book, either "oppositional intransitives" (as per Jasanoff, 2003, 51) or "anticausatives"[9] (which is

---

1978, this was expressed as a distinction between verbs taking a final subject originating as an initial direct object (i.e., unaccusatives — sometimes also referred to as ergatives) and verbs taking a final subject that was also an initial subject (i.e., unergatives). In the framework of Government and Binding (Chomsky, 1981, passim and subsequent literature), the sole argument of an unergative verb is a theta-marked deep structure subject, whereas the sole argument of an unaccusative verb is a theta-marked deep structure object that surfaces as a subject. Semantically, therefore, the (surface, or grammatical) subject of an unaccusative verb does not actively initiate or is not actively responsible for the action of the verb; rather, it has properties that it shares with the direct object of a transitive verb (or better, with the grammatical subject of its passive counterpart).

[7] It is, of course, not quite appropriate to speak of a "root's" valency at all, because valency can only be the property of a concrete verbal form.

[8] See, e.g., the extensive semantic study on causative alternation verbs in English by Levin/Rappaport Hovav, 1995, passim.

[9] The term "anticausative" is used here as a cover term for what Levin/Rappaport Hovav, 1995, esp. chap. 3, 79ff. refer to as "alternating unaccusatives" (e.g., English *break* in the intransitive or inchoative frame "the window broke"). This contrasts with the use of the term in Haspelmath, 1993, passim where it refers to the inchoative alternant only in languages where,

now the term preferred by some general linguists, e.g., by Méndez Dosuna, 2006).[10] The respective transitive forms, on the other hand, will hence be called "oppositional transitives"; note that in this book these terms are not meant to imply that either of them functions as the marked member of the binary opposition (see Allan, 2003, 54ff.).[11]

(2) Roots denoting activities such as 'kill', 'slay', 'beat', 'cut' (PIE *√gʷʰen, etc.). Active and middle forms derived from such roots were regularly used transitively, and middle forms could also be used as passive forms.[12]

(3) Roots denoting processes/activities/states regularly taken not to be caused by an external agent, such as PIE *√h₁es 'be', *√h₁ei̯ 'go', *√mer 'die',[13] *√bʰuH 'grow, become', *√(H)u̯ert 'turn (itr)',[14] *√su̯ep '(fall a)sleep', *√h₂anh₁ 'breathe', *√ĝerh₂ 'get old', *√pleu̯ 'soar'. External causation would have been seen as something rare and marked with respect to these verbs, the likes of which are called in current linguistic terminology "unergative verbs". Many of these roots

---

unlike in English, it involves special marking (e.g., a reflexive pronoun or clitic).

[10] As can already be guessed from the terms "causative alternation" and "anticausative", many general linguistic theories of today by the term "causative" regularly also refer to what I, following Jasanoff, call "oppositional transitives". Note further that anticausatives are a subset of unaccusatives, which is why they are sometimes called "alternating unaccusatives". That is, not all unaccusatives participate in the causative alternation (e.g., English *arrive* or *fall* do not).

[11] Note that Jasanoff, 2003, 180 seems to refer to alternating unaccusatives by the term "'bivalent' roots", but obviously does not count PIE *√u̯aĝ and *√ĝenh₁ among these.

[12] Of course, those passive forms and the intransitive middle forms built from the roots of type (1) may seem to be two birds of the same feather to more traditional IE linguistics, but certainly not to general linguists of today. For the passive in PIE, see most recently George, 2005, 2ff.

[13] See Barton, 1989. Pace Barton, 1989, 141, I do not think that Greek pairs such as δέρκομαι / ἔδρακον also belong here, i.e., that one should set up a PIE intransitive active root aorist *dérk̂-t standing beside a PIE middle present from this very root on account of the Greek evidence. As Watkins, 1969, 101 has shown, Greek thematic aorists of the ἔδρακον type rather directly go back to athematic middle ("Middle II") paradigms (that had 3.sg. forms with an ending PIE *-e).

[14] See Hoffmann, 1976, 590 and Goto, 1987, 63ff. for the Vedic evidence, and Meiser, 2003, 216 for the Latin material.

seem to have started out as activa tantum,[15] but then quite a number of them developed middle forms (especially in present/imperfect paradigms) in various branches. Most likely based on the model of the roots of types (1) and also (2), the respective active forms and even the new middle forms themselves then could be used transitively, i.e., as oppositional transitives expressing external agency (which originally had been viewed upon as highly marked with respect to these roots). Note that quite often it is not so easy to decide whether a PIE (and therefore also a Tocharian) root had originally belonged to type (1) or type (3); e.g., *√steh$_2$ seems rather to behave like an unergative verb in Vedic, but like an unaccusative verb (forming a huge number of transitive forms with meanings such as 'to make stand') not only in Greek, but also in other branches.

In what follows, I will use the term "causative" exclusively for verbal forms that denote *marked agentive* external causation, i.e., which render concepts such as 'make kill', 'make go', 'make breathe', and, of course, also 'make break (tr)', but not to forms denoting unmarked external causation, i.e., which render concepts such as 'break (tr)' = 'make break (itr)' (typical with PIE roots of the type (1), which can undergo the so-called 'causative alternation'). To the latter kind of transitive forms I will refer by the term 'oppositional transitive'. In other words, causatives are defined as based either on transitive verbal forms or on unergative intransitive verbs, but not on intransitive forms of an unaccusative verb.

On the other hand, it can be observed crosslinguistically that the same morphological devices are often used for the marking of causativity and oppositional transitives alike. Thus, Jamison, 1983, passim, and esp. 186 following a former suggestion by Paul Thieme, has shown that the Vedic presents in *-áya-* with PIE *o*-grade of the root at first had the function of forming transitives, and that their property to form causatives is a secondary feature. The development of a former transitivity marker to a marker of causativity can be observed crosslinguistically, see, e.g., Narrog, 2004, 351ff. for a study of Japanese and with references to North American languages.

The same double function of forming both transitives and causatives can be observed in Tocharian.

As we will see, Tocharian generally preserved the passive use of the PIE middle, but usually replaced the inherited aorist middle forms

---

[15] This is a very important insight owed to Lazzeroni; see Lazzeroni, 2002, 105ff.; 2003, 165ff.; and 2004, 139ff.; and also Benedetti, 2002, 20ff. (on evidence mainly coming from Vedic).

made from PIE unaccusative roots by respective forms from invariably active aorists in suffixal PIE *-eh$_2$[(e)h$_1$]-, much in the same way as Greek replaced its inherited aorist middles from unaccusative roots by invariably active aorists in suffixal -ē-. Tocharian, however, differed from Greek, inasmuch as it formed new subjunctives and presents on the basis of those aorists in pre-PT *-ā- → PT *-ā- (sic), and all of these verbal forms in PT *-ā- that ultimately derived from aorists in pre-PT *-ā- (sic) then together constituted the so-called grundverb paradigms. On the other hand, those very aorist stems in suffix pre-PT *-ā- → PT *-ā- could also function as their own causatives/ oppositional transitives.[16] On their basis new (reduplicated) present-stem formations in suffixal PT *-ā- with causative/oppositional transitive semantics were formed, which were subsequently enlarged by (*)-sk-. Finally, they themselves were teamed together with pre-PT ē-grade preterits enlarged by that ambivalent pre-PT *-ā- → PT *-ā- suffix, with the result that from many roots, fully-inflected additional (mostly just second) paradigms with causative/oppositional transitive semantics could emerge. What we are facing here is actually even a highly important feature of the Tocharian verbal system, as per Winter, 1960, 182, fn. 11 (similarly Watkins, 1962, 62): "The development of a formal contrast between transitive and intransitive verbs [is] apparently one of the important innovations in the Tocharian system."

4.4. Tocharian Causatives (the Kausativum)

There are basically two different morphological devices in Tocharian for denoting change in valency, scil. the formation of oppositional intransitives/anticausatives, oppositional transitives, and causatives: stem alternation and voice alternation (the latter almost never used to form true causatives, see immediately below).

The usual means of denoting valency increase, i.e., of forming an oppositional transitive to an intransitive unaccusative verb or of forming a causative to an intransitive unergative verb or to a transitive verb, was stem alternation, i.e., creating an antigrundverb paradigm (as it seems, essentially a device for forming oppositional

---

[16] See below 4.4., 4.9.1., 4.10.1., and note that in Baltic there exist both transitive and intransitive ē-preterits, and in Balto-Slavic both transitive and intransitive ā-preterits.

transitives only) and/or a kausativum paradigm (a device for forming both oppositional transitives and causatives).

If the question is asked the other way round, i.e., what has been the regular device for denoting true causativity, the answer will be that in that function almost always a special kind of kausativum paradigm is to be found, viz. one that consists of a present of Class IXb or Xb in Tocharian B (to which will respond a Class VIII present in Tocharian A), a subjunctive of Class IXb or Xb in Tocharian B (to which will respond a Class IX subjunctive in Tocharian A), and a preterit of either Class II or Class IV in both languages. The preterits of Class II (and also the respective imperatives of Class II and some irregular privative forms) excepted, all of these stems once ended in a thematically inflected suffix (*)-*sk*-/-*ṣṣ*-. Note, however, that the same kind of kausativum paradigms was also regularly used in order to form oppositional transitives to intransitive unaccusative grundverbs, while the antigrundverb way of forming oppositional transitives had obviously ceased to be productive in historical times.

Quite expectedly, there exist some exceptions to that general pattern. Voice alternation seems to have been used in order to create a causative to a transitive stem in the case of the Class VIII present from *[A]ākl*-, which means 'learn' in the middle (as does the respective TB Class IXa present) and 'teach' in the active (as do all, i.e., even the middle forms from the respective TB Class IXb present); but it should be borne in mind that verbal stems of the meaning 'learn; get taught' can show an irregular syntactic behavior also in other languages. In Ancient Greek, ἐδάη (of that very meaning) was the only η-aorist to be used transitively at all (as per Forssman, 1964, 17ff.), and in ModHG, *gelehrt werden* seems to be the only passive to a transitive verb that can be construed with an accusative.

On the other hand, it is doubtful whether there exists even one single antigrundverb paradigm acting as a causative to a transitive grundverb (*tsuk[(a)]*- '± suck out', Antigv. 'suckle, foster'), whereas there seems to be at least one antigrundverb form clearly acting as a causative to an unergative root (the Sub II Inf *śaccätsī*), see below 4.4.1. Finally it should be stressed that in some cases, what seems to be basically a non-causative (either transitive or unergative) stem in suffixal PT *-ā- ← pre-PT *-ā- (sic) could function as its own true causative, see below 4.9.1. and 4.10.1.

4.4.1. *A peculiar case of kausativum formation (kätk⁽ᵃ⁾-)*

A special and interesting case is *kätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cross, pass'. The grundverb is remarkable (x/x/a) (VI-VII-IXa/V/I), in that it can be construed both with and without obliquus form, see below 4.9.2. There are different stems attested in a causative meaning: a palatalized Prs IXb *śatkäṣṣeñca*; a palatalized Sub II Inf *śäccätsī* (MQ), which belongs to an antigrundverb morphologically; a non-palatalized Sub IXb *katkässi* (S), a Class II preterit, and a Class IV Ipv *kätkäṣṣar* (sic):

29 b 2 //// *ṣeme samudtär • śatkäṣṣeñca* "... indem er es [d.h. das Wesen] allein das Meer [der Geburt] überschreiten läßt" (TochSprR(B), transl., 48 with fn. 8; cf. also Dietz, 1981, 60); 108 b 3f. *tumeṃ trey śaiṣṣ(eṃ)s käṣṣi ceyna yältse trey jaṭil(ap)ūrvakaṃ ṣamāneṃ bhavākkärṣṣai yoñiyai eṃṣke katkässi añmassu • tarya orotstsana pratiharinta sälkāte-meś* "Darauf führte der Lehrer der drei Welten ihnen in dem Wunsche, diese 1003 Śramanas, die ehemaligen Flechtenträger, bis zur Stätte der letzten [höchsten] Existenz hinüberzubringen, die drei großen Wunder vor" (Carling, 2000, 323); 133 a 4 *krent yamor mā yamoṣäṃ ce(n n)o śäccätsī pkate* "die keine gute Tat getan Habenden beabsichtigte er aber hinüberzuführen" (Thomas, 1957, 134); 296 b 4 *gāṅkne olyisa tseñe kätkäṣṣar* (sic)[17] "lass [du] auf der Gaṅgā das Schiff [wtl. mit dem Schiff] die Flut überschreiten (gerichtet an einen Fährmann)" (Schmidt, 1974, 487); THT 3597 b 6 *śätkasta ceṃ cäk=aurce śar* "you (sg.) let them cross the wide river" (cf. Schmidt, 1983a, 274); 403, 3 *(pā)täräṃ m(a)täräṃ śätkatai* "you have let (your) fathers and mothers pass ...".

In Tocharian A, of the kausativum only the PPt is attested, referring to a cow out of control: A 360, 8 ////*rayaty atisr̥tavyāṃ | ki āläṣträ lyutār śaśätkusāṃ*. Schmidt, 1974, 500 and apud SWTF, s.v. *atisr̥tavyāṃ* emends and restores:[18] *(gāṃ vār)ayaty atisr̥tagāṃ* "er (der Stock, daṇḍaka Z. 7 {= A 360,7}) wehrt das ausgebrochene Rind ab"; he further compares the Pāli version *caṇḍaṃ pi goṇaṃ vareti*; on the basic meaning of TA *ki* as 'rug or cover with long fleece', see the discussion by Carling, DThTA, s.v. *ki*.

---

[17] The text has many orthographic peculiarities, as already pointed out by TochSprR(B); Stumpf, 1971a, 112f.; Thomas, 1993, 173ff. This does not come as a huge surprise, because the manuscript has now actually been dated to 1178-1255 by the radiocarbon method; see Tamai, 2005.

[18] Note that this restoration and the need to emend *atisr̥tavyāṃ* was already seen by W. Siegling (pers. copy).

Adams, DoT, 158f. assumes that the (palatalized) Prs IXb stem belongs to a special kausativum of the grundverb used transitively, and that the (unpalatalized) Sub IXb stem, the (palatalized) Sub II stem, the Pt II stem, and the Imp IV stem constitute a kausativum of the grundverb used intransitively. As a matter of fact, all of these forms except *śaccätsī* behave syntactically in a way that is typical of causatives to *transitive* verbs, i.e., they are construed with two complements;[19] *śaccätsī* alone is construed with just one single complement, the obliquus form *ceṃ*: 133 a 4 *ceṃ ... śaccätsī* (MQ) "he (intended) to let them (obl.) proceed'; 108 b 3 *ṣamāneṃ ... yoñiyai ... katkässi* 'letting the monks (obl.) cross the path (obl.)"; *śātkasta ceṃ cäk=aurce śar* "you (sg.) let them cross the wide river"; 296 b 4 *olyisa tseñe kätkäṣṣar* "let you the ship (perl.) cross the flood (obl.)".

However, despite its slightly different syntactic behavior, the Sub II seems to have as much a causative meaning as the kausativum forms, and the absence of a second complement is not diagnostic either, as argued in the preceding footnote.

---

[19] According to Krause, 1960, 148 (followed by Schmidt, 2007, 333) a Tocharian "Kausativ transitiver Grundverben" can either be constructed with a double obliquus (which Krause deemed the older construction) or with obliquus plus genitive or perlative (cf. now also Carling, 2009, 53f. and 58ff.). Note, however, that causatives to transitive grundverbs, i.e., Kausativum IV forms, do not necessarily have to be constructed with two complements (which, to be sure, neither Krause not Schmidt claimed). Cf. the Kaus. IV of *kärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'know, understand, recognize', which shows examples with just one object beside constructions with double obliquus: 325 a 5 *akālk śarsäṣṣäṃ-ne* "he makes him know(n) [his] desire" (double obliquus) vs. HMR 3 (= H 149.X.5) b 3 *tumeṃ sthulanānda ceᵤ tanāpateṃ śarsäṣṣi* "Thereupon Sthūlanandā instructed the contributor" (Broomhead I, 75f.); or the TA passage YQ 15 a 5 (cf. also A 215 b 6): *(ñäkta)ñ bramñkät śaśärsār kar • bramñkät śkaṃ wlāñkät śaśärs* "... (the Śuddhāvāsa gods) told only God Brahmā, and God Brahmā told Indra" (Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 50f.). Similarly, the 3.sg. Pt IV *kraupäṣṣa* from *kraup⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. IV 'let gather' is often attested in Vinaya texts in the phrase: *pañäkte sāṅk kraupäṣṣa* "Buddha had gathered the community". According to Thomas, 1979a, 240 "findet man in analogen Fällen dafür das Prät. vom Grundverb (B *kraupāte*), was letzten Endes doch auf eine engere Berührung beider Ausdrücke schließen läßt".

4.4.2. *Translations of Sanskrit causatives and the periphrastic construction with yām-*

True Skt. *aya*-causatives get usually translated by Tocharian kausativa forms, e.g., in the bilingual text 538 b 5, where Skt. *hāsayati* 'make laugh' is translated by Prs IXb *kerästrä* from *kery-* Kaus. I 'make laugh' (note the middle voice); similarly, the Prs IXb *ṣukäskeṃ* from *suk?-* Kaus. I 'let linger/hesitate" renders Skt. *vilambayanti* in 44 b 3. An especially notable example for the use of a Tocharian kausativum in order to render a true *aya*-causative is *īpäṣṣeñca* = Skt. *pātayantika*, the *nt*-participle of the Prs IXb of *yäp-* Kaus. I 'let enter', "almost surely a late calque on Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit", as per Adams, 1994a, 11, fn. 6. On the other hand, Skt. *prāpayati* in Uv I, 17 'gelangen lassen, treiben' is translated by the grundverb *āk-* 'lead', cf. Thomas, 1969a, 321f. The Vinaya rule HMR 1 a 2 that renders Skt. *khanyāt khānayed vā* "(who) digs or lets dig" has *rapanaṃ rāpatsi wat watkäṣṣäṃ* "(who) digs or commands to dig", cf. Schmidt, 2007, 334.

What does not seem to be attested is the rendering of a true Skt. *aya*-causative by a collocation of a noun with ^{AB}*yām-* 'do',[20] even though such collocations of ^{AB}*yām-* 'do' and the obliquus of an abstract noun are especially often used in order to render non-causative Skt. *aya*-forms, cf:
TB/TA *anumodit yām-* 'give approbation to' = Skt. *anumodayati* 'id.', *anumodit* < Skt. *anumodita-* 'approved, permitted' (attested in PK AS 16.3 a 5, see Pinault, 1989a, 183); *cotit yām-* 'accuse' = Skt. *codayati* 'id.', *cotit* < Skt. *codita-*, the PPP of √*cud* 'impel', only the *aya*-formation of which has the meaning 'accuse' (attested in PK AS 18B a 2, see Pinault, 1984, 380; 2008, 80); *sarit*/TA *sārit yām-* 'memorize' = Skt. *smārayati* 'id.', *sarit*/TA *sārit* < *sārita-* for *smārita-* due to Middle-Indic influence, see Pinault, 1989a, 183 (attested in PK AS 16.3 a 6f. and A 302 a 3).[21]

---

[20] For such formations cf. Krause, 1955, 31 with the examples TA *śtwar pāk yāmitär* "möge er Viertel machen", *waike lāre yāmtär* "wenn er die Lüge liebt (wörtl. „lieb macht")" and *ākli yamītär* 'learn'. See also the dossiers in Schmidt, 1974, 337ff. and in Adams, DoT, 491f. Some of these forms are even just periphrastic variants of otherwise attested primary or denominative simple verbs.

[21] Note that these frequently used collocations consisting of ^{AB}*yām-* 'do' and a noun that is a loan from Sanskrit are not confined to *aya*-formations, cf: *adhiṣṭhit yām-* 'take control of', *adhiṣṭhit* < Skt. *adhiṣṭhita-* 'controlled' (see Pinault, 1994, 159f.); *appamāt yām-*/ TA *appärmāt yām-* 'verächtlich machen'

4.5.   ANOTHER KIND OF VALENCY CHANGE BY STEM ALTERNATION
                        (THE ANTIGRUNDVERB)

As already mentioned in 4.4., oppositional transitives to intransitive
unaccusative grundverbs could be also provided by what I for
clarity's sake decided to call antigrundverb paradigms. There are less
antigrundverb paradigms than kausativum paradigms attested in this
function, and their morphological pattern evidently was not
productive any more in historical times. Unlike the kausativum
paradigms, antigrundverb paradigms as a rule do not seem to be used
as true causatives.[22]

4.5.1. *The antigrundverb*

If a root has three paradigms, the manuals speak of two different
"Kausativum" paradigms. However, in such a case only one of them
follows the productive pattern of the kausativa. The other paradigm
always consists of a present of Class VIII in both Tocharian A and B, a
subjunctive of Class I or II in both languages, respectively a Class VII
subjunctive in Tocharian A (being a rather regular inner-TA substitute
to a Class I subjunctive), and a preterit of Class III in both languages.
The following cases are attested:

ār⁽ᵃ⁾-/ (ᴬār⁽ᵃ⁾-) Gv. 'cease, come to an end' (itr), A 'leave, give up, abandon' (tr),
āl⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬāl⁽ᵃ⁾?- Gv. '± be restrained' (itr), A 'keep away, hold in check' (tr), *ās⁽ᵃ⁾-/
ᴬās⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'dry' (itr), A 'dry'; '(make ?) dry' (?), *aiw⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be turned toward,
incline to' (itr), A 'turn to', *ᴬkur⁽ᵃ⁾?-* Gv. 'age, become feeble' (itr), A 'make aged,
make become feeble' (tr), *krämp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be hindered, disturbed' (itr), A
'disturb, hinder' (tr), *kläṅk-/ ᴬkläṅk⁽ᵃ⁾?-* Gv. '± be in doubt, be insecure' (itr), A
'doubt' (tr), *tälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'be purged' (itr), A 'purge' (tr), *trik⁽ᵃ⁾- / ᴬtrik⁽ᵃ⁾-* Gv. 'go

---

= Skt. *avajānanti* 'sie machen verächtlich' (see Thomas, 1969a, 304ff.), *appamāt*
/ TA *appärmāt* < "wrong Sanskritization of Pkt. *appamāta-* (Pa. *appamatta-*)
from Skt. *alpa-mātra-* 'a little, a little merely'" (Carling, DThTA, s.v.
appärmāt); *nermit yām-* 'form (in a magical way)' = Skt. *nirminoti* 'id.', *nermit*
< Skt. *nirmita-* 'created (in a magical way)'; *nessait yām-*/TA *nesset yām-*
(always constructed with *war*/ TA *wär* 'water') 'put a spell (on water)', cf. Sieg,
1938, 54 (also attested in SHT I, 146 a 4 (MQ) *[wa]r niset yanäṣäle* "a spell is to
be cast on water", see Malzahn, 2007b, 301), maybe a loan from Skt. *niṣedha-*
'repulsion'.

    [22] The only exception(s) seem to be *tsuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. '± suckle, foster', for
which see the verbal index and possibly also the Sub II Inf *śaccätsī* in 133 a 4
(the passage is discussed above in the main text; see 4.4.1.).

astray, be confused' (itr), A 'miss, fail', 'go astray, stumble', 'lead astray' (tr/itr), *ᴬpäl⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'come to extinction' (itr), A 'extinguish' (tr), *pälk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬpälk⁽ᵃ⁾?*- Gv. 'burn' (itr), A 'burn, torment' (tr), *pruk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'jump, leap (away)' (itr), A 'overlook, neglect, ignore' (tr), *plänk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'come up, be for sale' (itr), A 'sell' (tr), *mus⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'rise, be pulled up' (itr), A 'lift, give up' (tr), *musk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'disappear, perish' (itr), A 'make subside' (tr), *mlutkᵃ̊*- Gv. 'escape' (itr), A 'take off' (tr), *yāt⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬyāt⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'be (cap)able' (itr), A 'tame' (tr), *räk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬräk?*- Gv. 'extend oneself (over)' (itr), A 'extend (over), cover' (tr), *ränk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'ascend, mount, climb up' (itr), 'ascend' (tr), *länk*- Gv. 'hang, dangle' (itr), A act. 'hang up' (tr), mid. 'be attached to' (itr)/ *ᴬlänk*- Gv. 'dangle' (itr), A 'let dangle' (tr), *ᴬlip⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'remain, be left over' (itr), A 'leave (behind)' (tr), *luk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬluk*- Gv. 'light up, be illuminated' (itr), A act./mid. 'illuminate' (tr), mid. 'light up' (itr), *wāk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬwāk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'split apart, bloom' (itr), A act. 'take apart, split apart' (tr), mid. 'differ' (itr), *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬwätk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'decide, be decided, differ' (itr), A 'separate, decide, answer' (tr), *wik⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬwik⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'disappear' (itr), A 'avoid' (tr), *sāk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬsāk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'remain over, remain behind' (itr), A act. 'restrain' (tr), mid. 'be left, restrain oneself' (itr), *sätk⁽ᵃ⁾-(/ ᴬsätk⁽ᵃ⁾*-) Gv. 'spread out' (itr), A 'spread' (tr), *säl⁽ᵃ⁾-(/ ᴬsäl⁽ᵃ⁾*-) Gv. 'fly, arise' (itr), A 'throw (down)' (tr), *spärk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬspärk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'disappear, perish' (itr), A 'get lost, go astray, disappear' (itr), *tsäm⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. 'grow, increase, come into being' (itr), A 'cause to grow, increase, promote' (tr), *tsuk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Gv. '± suck (out)' (tr), A '± suckle, foster' (tr).

As argued above, for clarity's sake I decided to call additional paradigms of this kind antigrundverb paradigms; note that I do not call paradigms of such a morphological shape antigrundverb paradigms whenever there clearly did not exist a respective grundverb paradigm — and especially I do not do so in cases where the absence of such a grundverb paradigm is indicated by the existence of a Sub III.

Antigrundverb paradigms in general function as oppositional transitives to intransitive unaccusative grundverbs, but there exists a small number of exceptions: in at least one case an antigrundverb acts as a causative to an unergative grundverb (Sub II Inf *śaccätsī* 133 a 4, see above 4.4.1.); sporadically, it merely transitivizes its intransitive grundverb (in the cases of *ār⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬār⁽ᵃ⁾*-, *trik⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬtrik⁽ᵃ⁾*-, *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬwätk⁽ᵃ⁾*-, *pruk⁽ᵃ⁾-*, *ᴬklänk⁽ᵃ⁾?-*, see immediately below); for anti-grundverb forms that do have intransitive meaning themselves, see 4.5.1.1. below. Looked at the other way round, beside antigrundverb paradigms and their respective grundverb paradigms one finds quite often also forms from yet another additional, i.e., a third paradigm attested, which always follows the morphological pattern of the kausativum paradigms that have a Class IXb present in Tocharian B, and which in my terminology then has to go for a Kausativum II, a

Chapter Four

term meant just to denote a distributional, and no functional, property, i.e., attestation beside an antigrundverb. Again in very few cases, each of the three paradigms differs semantically from each of the other two, the most notable and most evident case is ^(AB)*wāk*^(a)- Gv. 'split apart, bloom', Antigv. act. 'take apart', mid. 'differ', Kaus. II 'let bloom'. Since the antigrundverb formation itself was clearly not a productive device for forming oppositional transitives in historical times anymore, in contrast to the formal model of the kausativa, very often antigrundverb and kausativum stems show the same meaning.

In the following I list all attested antigrundverbs together with their respective grundverb and, if attested, kausativum paradigms standing beside them. Note that the respective grundverb always has a subjunctive of Class V[23] and a preterit of Class I (alternatively Pt 0 in Tocharian A and once Pt VII in Tocharian B), but that the present stem classes differ, so that I have arranged the list according to the present stem classes of the grundverb:

	Grundverb	Antigrundverb	Kausativum
	Prs I (/+ VIII)		
läṅk-	'hang, dangle' (itr) (−) (I/-/I)	act. 'hang up', mid. 'be attached to' (tr/itr) (m/a/-) (VIII/I/-)	'let dangle' (tr) (−) (IXb/-/-)
^(A)*läṅk-*	'dangle' (itr) (a+/-/-) (I/-/-)		'let dangle' (tr) (a/a/-) (VIII/VII/II+III)
säl^(a)-	'fly, arise' (itr) (-/-/m) (-/-/I)	'throw' (tr) (-/-/x) (-/II/I)	'throw' (tr) (a/-/-) (IXb/IXb/II)
^(A)*säl*^(a)-	'fly, arise' (itr) (a+/-/-) (I/-/I)		'throw' (tr) (−) (VIII/-/-)
	Prs III/IV (/+VIII)		
ār^(a)-	'cease, come to an end' (itr) (m/a/a) (IV/Va/I)	'leave, give up, abandon' (tr) (a+/x/a) (VIII/I/III)	'give up, abandon' (tr) (a/m/a) (IXa+b/IXa/IV)

---

[23] In the following table TB Sub V stems with initial accent are indicated by "Va", those with accentuation according to the basic rule by "Vs".

	Grundverb	Antigrundverb	Kausativum
ᴬār⁽ᵃ⁾-	'cease, come to an end' (itr) (m/a/a) (IV/V/I)	'give up, abandon' (tr) (a/-/-) (VIII/-/IV)	
āl⁽ᵃ⁾-	'± be restrained' (itr) (—) (IV/-/-)	'keep away, hold in check' (tr) (m+/m/-) (IXb/I/III)	
ᴬāl⁽ᵃ⁾ˀ-	—	'keep away, hold in check' (tr) (m/-/m) (VIII/VII/III)	—
ās⁽ᵃ⁾-	'dry (out)' (itr) (m/-/a) (IV/-/I)	'dry (out)' (itr) (—) (-/-/III)	'make dry' (tr) (a/-/-) (IXb/-/-)
ᴬās⁽ᵃ⁾-	'dry (out)' (itr) (m/a/a) (IV/V/I)	'(make ?) dry' (?) (-/-/a) (-/-/III)	—
aiw⁽ᵃ⁾-	'be turned toward, incline to' (itr) (m/-/a) (IV/-/I)	'turn to' (tr) (m/m/-) (IXb/IoII/-)	
kurᵃˀ-	'age' (itr) (m/-/-) (IIoIII/-/-)	—	—
ᴬkur⁽ᵃ⁾ˀ-	'age, become feeble' (itr) (—) (-/-/I)	'make aged, make become feeble' (tr) (m/-/-) (VIII/-/III)	
krämp⁽ᵃ⁾-	'be hindered, disturbed' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/Vs/I)	'disturb, hinder' (tr) (a/-/a) (VIII/IoII/III)	—
ᴬkrämpᵃ-	'be hindered, disturbed' (itr) (—) (-/V/I)	—	—
trik⁽ᵃ⁾-	'go astray, be confused' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V?/I)	'miss, fail'; 'go astray, stumble'; 'lead astray' (tr/itr) (a/x/a) (VIII/II/III)	act. 'lead astray', mid. 'faint' (tr) (a/-/x) (IXb/-/II)
ᴬtrik⁽ᵃ⁾-	'be confused; faint' (itr) (m+/a/a) (III/V/I)	'fail, miss', etc. (tr/itr) (a+/-/a) (VIII/II/III)	—

	Grundverb	Antigrundverb	Kausativum
Apäl(a)-	'come to extinction' (itr) (m/-/-) (III/-/-)		'extinguish' (tr) (a/-/a) (VIII/-/III)
pälk(a)-	'burn' (itr) (m/-/-) (III/-/-)	'burn, torment' (tr) (x/m/x) (VIII/II/III)	—
Apälk(a)?-	—		'burn, torment' (tr) (a/-/m) (VIII/II/II)
pländk(a)-	'come up, be for sale' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/Vs/I)	'sell' (tr) (x/a/a) (VIII/II/III)	—
musk(a)-	'disappear, perish' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/Vs/I)		'make subside' (tr) (a/-/-) (IXb/II/-)
yāt(a)-	'be (cap)able' (itr) (m/a/a) (IV/Va/I)	'tame' (tr) (a/-/a) (VIII/-/III)	'enable, tame' (tr) (-/x/m) (IXb/IXb/II+IV)
Ayāt(a)-	'be (cap)able' (itr) (m/a/-) (IV/V/I)		'enable, tame' (tr) (a/m/-) (VIII/VII/-)
lipä-	'remain, be left over' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/Vs/I)	—	—
Alip(a)-	'remain, be left over' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I)	'leave (behind)' (tr) (-/a/a) (-/VII/III)	—
luk(a)-	'light up, be illuminated' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/Va/I)	act./mid. 'illuminate', mid. 'light up' (tr/itr) (x/m/x) (VIII/II/III)	—
Aluk-	'light up, be illuminated' (itr) (-/-/m) (-/-/0)		'illuminate' (tr) (a/-/a) (VIII/-/II+III)
wāk(a)-	'split apart, bloom' (itr) (m/a/-) (IV/Va/I)	mid. 'differ' (itr) (m/-/-) (VIII/-/-)	'let bloom' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/IXb/IV)

	Grundverb	Antigrundverb	Kausativum
^Awāk^(a)-	'split apart, break apart, burst' (itr) (-/a/x) (-/V/0+I)	act. 'take apart', mid. 'differ' (tr/itr) (m+/a/a) (VIII/VII/III)	—
wätk^(a)-	'decide', 'be decided', 'differ' (itr) (-/x/a) (-/Vs/I)	'separate', 'decide' (tr) (-/a/a) (-/I+II/III)	'command' (tr) (a/a/a) (IXb/IXb/II)
^Awätk^(a)-	'separate', 'be separated', 'be decided' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I)	'separate', 'decide', 'answer' (tr) (-/a/a) (-/IX/III)	'command' (tr) (a/-/a) (VIII/-/II)
wik^(a)-	'disappear' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/Vs/I)	'avoid' (tr) (a/a/-) (VIII/II/-)	'drive away, remove' (tr) (a/a/a) (IXb/IXb/II)
^Awik^(a)-	'disappear' (itr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I)	'avoid' (tr) (a/-/-) (VIII/-/III)	'drive out, remove' (tr) (a+/a/a) (VIII/IX/II)
sāk^(a)-	'remain over, remain behind' (itr) (—) (-/-/I)	mid. 'be left, restrain oneself' (itr) (m/-/-) (VIII/-/-)	'restrain, leave behind' (tr) (a/-/-) (IXb/IXb/-)
^Asāk^(a)-	'remain' (itr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I)		'restrain' (tr) (-/a/-) (VIII/VII/-)
sätk^(a)-	'spread out' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/Vs/I)		'spread' (tr) (a/-/m) (IXb/-/III)
^Asätk^(a)-	'spread out' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I)		'spread' (tr) (a/-/a) (VIII/-/II)
^Asik^(a)-	'be overflown' (itr) (m/a/-) (III/V/I)		'make overflow' (tr) (—) (-/-/IIoIII)
spärk^(a)-	'disappear, perish' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/Vs/I)	'get lost', 'go astray' (itr) (-/a/-) (-/II/-)	'cause to disappear, destroy' (tr) (a/a/m) (IXb/IXb/II)

	Grundverb	Antigrundverb	Kausativum
ᴬspärk⁽ᵃ⁾-	'disappear, perish' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/V/I)	'get lost, disappear' (itr) (-/?/a) (-/I/III)	'cause to disappear, destroy' (tr) (x/-/m) (VIII/IX/II)
tsäm⁽ᵃ⁾-	'grow, increase, come into being' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/Vs/I)	'cause to grow, increase, promote' (tr) (a/m/a) (VIII/IoII/III)	—
ᴬtsäm⁽ᵃ⁾-	'grow, increase, come into being' (itr) (m/-/-) (III/V/I)	—	'increase, cause to grow' (tr) (a/-/m) (VIII/IX/II)

Prs V

	Grundverb	Antigrundverb	Kausativum
tälp⁽ᵃ⁾-	'be purged' (itr) (—) (V/-/-)	'purge' (tr) (—) (-/IoII/-)	—

Prs VI

	Grundverb	Antigrundverb	Kausativum
pruk⁽ᵃ⁾-	'jump, leap (away)' (itr) (x/-/a) (VI/-/I)	'overlook, neglect, ignore' (tr) (m/-/a) (VIII/-/VII)	—
mus⁽ᵃ⁾-	'rise, be pulled up' (itr) (m/-/-) (VI/-/I)	'lift, give up' (tr) (—) (-/II/-)	—

Prs unattested

	Grundverb	Antigrundverb	Kausativum
kläṅk-	—	'doubt' (tr) (m/-/-) (I/I/III)	—
ᴬkläṅk⁽ᵃ⁾ʔ-	'± be in doubt, be insecure' (itr) (—) (-/-/I)	'doubt' (tr) (-/a/-) (VIII/VII/-)	—
räk⁽ᵃ⁾-	'extend oneself (over)' (itr) (-/m/-) (-/Va/I)	'extend (over), cover' (tr) (a+/a/x) (VIII/I+II/III)	—

	Grundverb	Antigrundverb	Kausativum
ᴬräk?-	—	'extend (over), cover' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/-/III)	—
räṅk⁽ᵃ⁾-	'ascend, climb up' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/Va/I)	'ascend' (tr) (a/-/a) (VIII/I/III)	—
tsuk⁽ᵃ⁾-	'± suck (out)' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/Va/I)	'± suckle; foster' (tr) (a/-/a) (VIII/I/III)	—
ᴬtsukᵃ-	'drink' (tr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I)	—	—

This pattern is also to be seen with what are synchronically different roots, viz. intransitive *lä-n-t-* 'go out, emerge' and transitive *lut-* 'remove', *lut-* (IXa/II/III) being diachronically a causative or oppositional transitive to **lät-.*

4.5.1.1. *Remarkable forms (mostly intransitives)*

The antigrundverb of *säl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'fly' has a Class I preterit with palatalized root initial instead of a Class III preterit; on the stem see Malzahn, in print a. The roots *trik⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'err, etc.' and *spärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'disappear, etc.' behave very unusually with respect to valency. The antigrundverb of *trik⁽ᵃ⁾-* can be both transitive and intransitive, while the antigrundverb of *spärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* even is always intransitive,[24] and this despite the fact that we are (almost) exclusively dealing with active forms, i.e., we do not have to do with valency alternation by voice alternation as is, e.g., attested for the antigrundverb of *ᴬᴮwāk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. act. 'take apart', mid. 'differ' (for voice alternation see below for details). Furthermore, the intransitive antigrundverb paradigms of *trik⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'err, etc.' and *spärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'disappear, etc.' seem to differ slightly in meaning from the respective intransitive grundverb. The intransitive 1.sg. Pt III forms TA *prasku* 'I am afraid' in A 230 b 3 from *ᴬpärsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be afraid' (as per Schmidt/ Winter, 1992, 53 = Winter, 2005, 437), and most likely also TA *wīyu* 'I

---

[24] Carling, 2003, 68 and 2009, 61 glosses its "present VIII" stem (i.e., what I call antigrundverb stem) by 'avoid', but nevertheless correctly points out in 2003, 71 that the only certain example in PK AS 7G b 3 is intransitive, but "animated": "the beings disappear".

was scared' from *ᴬwi⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be frightened' of A 295 a 4 (as per Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 54 = Winter, 2005, 438).

4.5.1.1.1. *trik⁽ᵃ⁾*-

The manuals translate the antigrundverb ("first kausativum") of *trik⁽ᵃ⁾*- with 'fehlen, verfehlen' (see WTG, 250f.; TEB I, 208, § 376; TEB II, 200), and the kausativum with 'in die Irre führen, verwirren'. Adams, DoT, 314ff. glosses the "first causative" with 'err, make a mistake', the construction with perlative by 'err because of', and the collocation *ytāri trik-* by 'mistake the way; do wrong'. As for the second, he translates the (emended) middle *traikate* as a genuine passive 'was lost', concluding that "[t]he first 'causative' is essentially an intensive of the Grundverb while the second 'causative' is more truly a causative in that it makes the underlying verb transitive". In contrast, Carling, 2003b, 73 with fn. 20 (p. 74) states that there is "no semantic difference as compared to present III", and that "[t]he translation 'in die Irre führen, verwirren' [...] seems to be a ghost", which is not quite correct in my opinion. The antigrundverb rather seems to have the transitive meaning 'miss something, fail someone' in the following instances:

29 b 5 *(ṣe)mi wnolmi tetrikoṣ ytariṃ ṣeṃ aknātsaññesa* "some beings [had] mistaken [their] ways out of ignorance" (as translated by Adams, l.c.; cf. TochSprR(B), transl., 49: "einige Wesen hatten die Wege verfehlt aus Unwissenheit"); 282 b 2f. *k̂ᵤse ṣañ pälskontse lkā{ṃ}trä astarññe aiśamñe mā yairu läṃ yäknemeṃ späntai yāmäṃ taṅw=āñmalaṣṣä(lñesa) – – – – (su) palsko ṣañ tsetserñu trikṣäṃ wäntre* "wer [zwar] die Reinheit des eigenen Denkens sieht, [aber], [weil] er den Verstand nicht geläutert [hat], von der [rechten] Weise abgeht [und] [nur] auf Liebe [und] Mitleid vertraut [wtl. vertrauensvoll macht] ..., (der) ... verfehlt das Ziel" (Schmidt, 1974, 346); 293 a 3 *ytāri triśäṃ* "he misses the [right] course"; S 6 (= PK AS 5C) b 6 *poyś(i)ññeṃ kauñäktentso pärkālñe triśim manta* "das Aufgehen der der letzten [höchsten] Existenz angehörigen Allerkenner-[Allwisser-]Sonnen möchte ich keineswegs [durchaus nicht] verfehlen" (Thomas, 1966a, 176, fn. 10; see also Pinault, 1990a, 67); S 8 (= PK AS 4B) b 4 *poyśiññeṣṣai ekṣalymeṃ mā triśīmar källoym ṣpä os(tm)e(ṃ lantsi)* "nicht möchte ich um die Zeit der Allwisserschaft herumkommen" (Thomas, 1966a, 181, fn. 1); 241 b 1 *po śauläṣṣeṃ klautkenne śaultsa lareṃ triśim-c mā* "in all situations in life, I will not fail you, dear one of my life" (cf. Pinault, 2008, 331).

On the other hand, the antigrundverb can also be used intransitively, and then has the meaning 'fail, go astray, stumble':

282 b 1 (MQ) *sn(ai) parwā lestaimeṃ tsāṅkaṃ su kl(ā)y(aṃ) n(o) k(eṃ)tsa wiñcaññe śa(r)wa(r)ñ(e)sa tr(i)kṣä(ṃ)* "(if a bird) without feathers rises from the nest, and then falls to the ground, he makes a mistake because of [his] *wicaññe* pride" (cf. Adams, DoT, 315); the next line has *trikṣäṃ* in transitive use, see above; H 149.15 b 2 *su kr͡ui r(a) triśäṃ* "[a]lso if this one should stumble" (Broomhead I, 183f.); H 149.295 a 3f. *poyśiṃñ k(ektseñe) mā t(r)iśi* "the body of omniscience ... should not go astray" (Broomhead I, 131); H 150.111 b 2 *poyśiññana ekṣalyänmeṃ man(ta) triśye(ṃ)* "the Buddha epochs should never fail" (Broomhead I, 149, 152); K 2 a 5 *te keklyauṣormeṃ (e)pastyaññe yänmācer yāmor nta yāmtsi mā ṣpä triścer makā-ykne* "wenn ihr dieses gehört habt, werdet ihr Erfahrung erlangen die Taten zu tun und nicht so vielfach zu straucheln" (Sieg, 1938, 7); K 7 b 3 *(k͡use) c(e)y onolm(i e)ṅ(kä)ltsa tsäṅkoṣ duśśīlñesa trīkeṃ ṣpärkeṃ ette cmelne tmaskenträ* "diese Wesen, welche wenn sie in aus Leidenschaft entstandenem schlechtem Charakter irren und sich vergehen in niederer Geburt [wieder]geboren werden" (Sieg, 1938, 32); K 8 a 1 *(śle=a)knātsa(ññe) m(ai)mtsa trikseṃ duśśīläñe yamaskeṃ* "(einige Wesen hier) voll Unwissenheit straucheln in [ihrem] Ermessen und zeigen schlechten Charakter" (Sieg, 1938, 33f.); restored *(t)r(ai)ksa* in 370 b 1 is without much context: //// *(t)r(ai)ksa kentsa kl(āya)* //// "... fell to the ground", and the same applies to //// *ime traiksa •* in PK AS 13G b 2 (reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), and also to the new attestation of the *nt*-Part in THT 1686 a 3: /// *ltsa k͡use trīkṣeñca* ////.[25]

Finally, the antigrundverb of *trik⁽ᵃ⁾-* seems to have the same meaning 'lead astray' that is assigned to the Kausativum II in the Ger

---

[25] As for the function of the complement in the perlative found in these cases, instrumental function is recommended by the fact that a similar passage is attested in Tocharian A, which has a special case form for the instrumental: A 55 b 3 *trikseñc ākntsāñ eṅkälyo* "the ignorant err because of [their] passion". According to Kölver, 1965, 63, the perlative of *maim* 'Ermessen, Beurteilung' in the passage K 8 a 1 has modal function just like in 240 a 3: "nach Ermessen", but causal function is much more likely: "they err because of their wrong judgment" (for the functions of the perlative in general, see Carling, 2000, 12ff., 262ff.). To judge from the examples in Carling, 2000, 238ff., abstracts are rather used in the locative and allative than in the perlative, and the function of perlatives from abstracts is also often difficult to make out (Carling, 2000, 241f.). However, A 81 b 4 *lānt semā ype mäskatär* clearly means "the country is *under the protection* of the king" (Carling, l.c.; cf. Schmidt, 1974, 109).

II *triśälle* in 261 b 4 *śaiṣṣ(e) triśälle*, which Thomas, 1952, 35 translates as "die sündhafte Welt" (the form is without further context). To be sure, the concept of the world that leads astray (rather than the world that fails or goes astray) is the most likely interpretation. Pace Adams, DoT, 315, however, I do not take 293 b 1 for another instance of the antigrundverb denoting 'lead astray', because of the absence of an object. Whereas 293 b 1 *eśnesa meṅkitse (su) tkā ra (t)rīśäṃ aiśaumye ceu̯ nakse(ntär)* Adams renders by "he [is] lacking eyes; thus the wiseman will lead [him] astray and they reproach him", I would rather opt for "the wise man will go astray".

At last, the PPt *tetriku* can have both the meaning 'missed, failed', i.e., belong to the antigrundverb, i.e., the Pt III stem, and 'have been led astray', i.e., belong to the kausativum (see WTG, 177, § 172, fn. 1.).

The interpretation of what must be finite forms of the kausativum of this root is not without difficulties:

The evident Pt II *traikane* in 90 b 3 (which is the correct reading of the manuscript) has to be emended to *traikate*, according to TochSprR(B), 27, fn. 22, i.e., to a middle form; differently WTG, 251 (*traika-ne*) and TEB I, 246, § 440,2. The form is to be translated as 'he fainted', see Schmidt, 2001, 320. Since the same meaning 'faint' is attested for the intransitive grundverb in Tocharian A, a middle (either intransitive or rather passive 'he was confused' → 'fainted', thus Schmidt, 2001, fn. 121) is indeed to be preferred. A middle *traikate* is further said to be attested in H 149.290 b 3 by WTG, 251; Broomhead I, 214, and Schmidt, 1974, 137. Schmidt translates: "das Denken wurde alsdann dem Elenden verwirrt". Actually, to judge from the manuscript, it is rather to be read *traika-ne*: //// *palsko traika-ne ot talānte • teksa aśyai oṃṣameṃ*, and accordingly to be translated: "the spirit of the wretched one led him astray; he touched the nun from above". On the other hand, if the form should be emended to a middle one, the meaning would again have to be passive 'he was led astray'. *tr[ai](ka)////* in H 150.119 a 1 is unclear. The sole attestation of the Prs or Sub IXb form *trīkäṣṣäm* in THT 2380 frg. z a 1 is without much context, though //// *läkle trīkäṣṣaṃ* //// "suffering leads astray" is not too absurd.

In Tocharian A as well, both transitive and intransitive forms are attested in the antigrundverb of [A]*trik(a)-* (cf. TEB I, 208, § 376 and TEB II, 107).

Transitive use is the only likely analysis for the 1.sg. TA *triksam* in A 160 a 5, although the context is fragmentary: *ñi ime triksa(m)* "I confuse my recollection"; A 227/8 b 4f. *k̇uc(e) pat nu wras(añ)*

metrakäṃ śpālmeṃ käṣṣiṃ • p ͡ᵤk<ä>ṣ puk lo triksenc is analyzed as
one sentence unit and the verbal form as a transitive one by Thomas,
1997, 108, fn. 189: "... oder welche Wesen den Maitreya, den
vorzüglichen Lehrer, ganz und gar verfehlen ...". The PPt TA *tatriku*
has the meaning 'missed', and is constructed with TA *ytār* 'way, path'
(A 405 a 3) in the same way as TB *trik⁽ᵃ⁾-* can go together with the
cognate *ytāri*. The Ger TA *triślune* means 'error, misconduct'. The *nt*-
Part TA *trikṣant* in A 80 a 4 is without much context, but since it is
parallel to TA *āknats* 'ignorant', one can guess that the form means
something like 'the confused one'. The Inf TA *trikässi* clearly has the
transitive meaning 'to confuse, lead astray' (A 6 b 1; the attestation in
A 136 a 6 is without context); the same is true for the *m*-Part TA
trikäsm(āṃ) 'confusing (the senses)' in A 312 b 3. The PPt TA *caccrīku*
that must belong to a kausativum Pt II has the special meaning 'have
committed a sin against someone' in A 220 b 4, see Thomas, 1957, 291.

On the other hand, intransitive use of an active antigrundverb
form is attested in A 55 b 3: *triksenc ākntsāñ eṅkälyo* "the ignorant err
because of [their] passion". The morphologically irregular and
therefore more archaic 1.sg. active *s*-preterit TA *trīkū* in A 295 a 4 (as
per Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 54 = Winter, 2005, 438) is intransitive as
well: *wīyu trīkū cam klopyo* "ich war verstört [und] verwirrt durch
dieses Leid".

4.5.1.1.2. *spärk⁽ᵃ⁾-*

In each of the two languages there exits only one single form that is
diagnostic with respect to the valency of the stem, and each of those is
certainly intransitive:

K 7 b 3 *(k̯ᵤse) c(e)y onolm(i e)ṅ(kä)ltsa tsäṅkoṣ duśśīlñesa trīkeṃ
ṣpärkeṃ ette cmelne tmaskenträ* "diese Wesen, welche, wenn sie in
aus Leidenschaft entstandenem schlechtem Charakter irren und sich
vergehen, in niederer Geburt [wieder]geboren werden" (Sieg, 1938,
32). Sieg further states in fn. 1 that the verb in this passage shows up
"in der übertragenen Bedeutung 'sich vergehen, fehlen'", whereas the
basic meaning, according to him, is 'sich verlieren'.

In Tocharian A we have *spärksā-m pältsäk* "reasoning disappeared
from them" in A 239 a 2 = A 222 a 4 (for the reading and word
separation see TochSprR(A), "Nachträge", 254, ad p. 110). Since TA
pältsäk is genus alternans, the fem. deictic pronoun *sām* cannot be an
attribute of that form; accordingly, a word separation *spärk sām
pältsäk* is excluded, and we are certainly faced with: *(•) spärksā-m
pältsäk tmāk särki arnaṃ mäskär umparñe* "reasoning disappeared

from them [and] consequently they became evil in [their] appearance".

A third, and a possible fourth example of an intransitive antigrundverb evidenced by a Class III preterit form are 1.sg.act. TA *prasku* 'I am afraid' in A 230 b 3 from ^A^*pärsk*^(ä)^- 'be afraid' (as per Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 53 = Winter, 2005, 437), and 1.sg.act. TA *wīyu* 'I was scared' from ^A^*wi*^(ä)^- 'be frightened' in A 295 a 4 (as per Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 54 = Winter, 2005, 438), provided the latter is not a form that originally belonged to a Class I preterit.

It is certainly no coincidence that three of these functionally irregular forms, viz. the 1.sg. Pt III forms TA *prasku*, TA *trīkū*, and TA *wīyu* are also morphologically irregular by showing the original ending of the 1.sg. (see chap. Pt III). On the other hand, the intransitive antigrundverb forms from Pt III paradigms TA *trīku*, TA *wīyu*, TA *spärksā-m*, and also TA *wläs* 'died', which is another intransitive Pt III form, but clearly one that did not belong to an antigrundverb paradigm, all have *ä as their root vowels, and at least TA *spärksā-m* by its root-initial *s*- no doubt suggests that all of these intransitive forms contain pre-PT zero grades, and not pre-PT *e*-grades, of the root.[26] Accordingly, one will obviously have to assume that among the (multiple) inputs to preterit Class III there had also figured basically intransitive zero-grade root formations (which one would then prefer to derive from middle preterital forms). As for intransitive TA *prasku* with a PT æ-grade, of course it does not come as a huge surprise that an active form belonging to what evidently was an unergative stem could preserve the intransitive semantics to be expected for both an active perfect form and an active aorist form built from such a root or stem.

4.6. Two Morphonological Traits Found With Kausativa

As mentioned above sub 4.4., for the purpose of denoting valency alternation the speakers of (Proto-)Tocharian had a variety of different purely morphological devices at their disposal. It is, however, quite obvious that at least in Tocharian B two rather morphonological traits

---

[26] Note that if TA *wläs* belongs with Gk ἑάλω 'got caught (in a military action)' etymologically, a 3.sg. form with a PIE *e*-grade should rather have resulted in a TA form ending in *-ās, i.e., TA *wläs* is also best taken for an old zero-grade form.

were also in use for forming and marking causatives and oppositional transitives, viz. initial accent and palatalization of root-initial consonants or consonant clusters — the first trait being found quite regularly in all essential parts (i.e., Prs, Sub, and Pt) of the kausativum paradigms that functioned as causatives or oppositional transitives, the second trait being consistently found only with Pt II and (to a somewhat lesser extent) with Imperative II forms. As for possible initial accent in TA kausativum paradigms, we cannot be sure about the placement of word accent in general; however, since full vowels that must have implemented the syllable peaks of initial syllables never get weakened nor deleted in Tocharian A, it is a rather certain that full vowels functioning as syllable peaks of initial syllables regularly bore the word accent even in historical times, and that therefore initial accent could hardly have functioned as a device for denoting causativity/oppositional transitivity in Tocharian A at all. On the other hand, original root-initial palatalization at least should, of course, have left traces in many surface forms of Tocharian A as well, but actually there are many roots, especially roots starting with a *k-*, that do not undergo root-initial palatalization, neither in the Pt II forms nor in the Imperative II forms of Tocharian A.

4.6.1. *The initial accent in Tocharian B*

Winter, 1980, 438ff. = 2005, 220ff. claimed that initial accent in Tocharian B was a morphological feature to denote causativity or transitivity. At the time, he did not come up with a diachronic explanation for that fact and in any case assumed that this was not an inherited feature in the first place. In contrast, Tocharian A, he said, because of its mechanical accent did not develop this characteristic, which is indeed very likely. As for the TB oppositional transitive/ causative stems of present/subjunctive Classes IXb-XIb, Winter was certainly correct in stating that as a rule it is the initial accent that marks the valency and not merely the *sk*-stem formation, because *sk*-stem formations without initial accent are not oppositional transitives or causatives.[27] A similar initial accent is to be found in the TB preterit

---

[27] It is difficult to judge whether there exist some causative/oppositional transitive Prs/Sub IX forms lacking initial accent beside the case of *pārāk⁽ᵃ⁾-*. Possible candidates include the Abstr I *wätkāṣṣälyñe* 'command' (Š) from *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II 'command' (attested beside regular Prs/Sub IXb forms). However, although it comes from a central text, the form can indeed be an

of Class II alongside initial palatalization. Winter further speculated whether the initial palatalization in the *s*-preterit Class III is a feature of verbs of motion and linked with transitivity, and he also pointed out that *ā*-subjunctives in Tocharian B standing beside (transitive) Class VI nasal presents have initial accent, those standing beside (intransitive) presents of Class III have non-initial accent. Although this is perfectly true as a pattern, his survey covered only one part of the material. As is discussed in detail in chap.s Sub I/V and Prs III/IV, the initial accent in all of these stem classes can, in my opinion, be explained diachronically (basically by setting up former reduplicated forms, which by now has also become the strategy adopted by Winter) with a few analogical developments, e.g., as is certainly to be assumed in the case of the Class IXb forms; see the discussion in the respective chapters.

4.6.2. *Initial palatalization*

Beside the initial accent, palatalization of the root initial consonant (cluster) is another feature to be found with oppositional transitive and causative stem formations. But in contrast to initial accent, which is a quite regular feature in the TB kausativum stem classes, root-initial palatalization is no such regular marker of transitivity/ causativity. Thus, in the present/subjunctive Classes IXb and Xb there are forms attested with and without initial palatalization, sometimes even within the same paradigm, and in general it looks like the palatalized forms are merely archaisms, see the detailed discussion in chap. Prs/Sub IX. The only pattern that can be found is that all examples of palatalized Prs/Sub IXb forms have a preterit of Class II beside them, and such preterits show initial palatalization in Tocharian B on a regular basis. Note, however, that we find non-palatalized Prs/Sub IXb forms beside Class II preterits as well, e.g., *klutk*[a]*-* Kaus. I 'make turn', which has a palatalized Pt II, but an unpalatalized Prs/Sub IXb stem, and this stem is attested quite often in texts from all provenances.

   Some kausativum (or antigrundverb) formations showing initial palatalization are especially noteworthy. The triple root *säl*[a]*-* 'fly' has a Class I preterit stem with palatalized root initial *ṣāllā-* in the

---

MQ form, see the discussion in chap. Prs/Sub IX. Another candidate is *ṣpärkaṣṣälle* from *spärk*[a]*-* Kaus. II 'destroy' attested in the Weber manuscript, where one cannot exclude copying from an older MQ manuscript as well.

antigrundverb instead of a Class III preterit as is usual beside a normal Class I preterit *sālā-* in the grundverb. In this case, however, I do not think that the initial palatalization is a recent, secondary marker of transitivity, but I believe that we are rather dealing with an anticipatory shift of palatalization from the root final to the initial in pre-TB *säl'l'° and *sāl'l'° to *s'äl(')l(')° and *s'āl(')l(')°, as is argued in chap. Sound Laws 1.7.

A causative 1.sg.act. *ṣṭamāwa* (sic) is attested from *stäm[(a)]-* Kaus. I 'put' (PK NS 31 a 3, see Pinault, 1994, 107, fn. 4), which is remarkable in two ways; first because both Pt II and Pt IV forms are already attested as preterit stems of the Kausativum I, and second because *ṣṭ°* as palatalization product of *st°* is very odd. The form is, in my opinion, not a secondary creation, but rather an archaism, and the palatalization again rather due to metathesis, see chap.s Sound Laws 1.7. and Pt I 7.3.7.

A different case are palatalized subjunctive Class II forms belonging to antigrundverbs such as *śäccätsī* from *kätk[(a)]-* 'cross, pass' (as discussed above), 3.sg.mid. *lyuśtär* from *luk[(a)]-* Antigv. 'illuminate', Abstr *pälyśalñe/pilycalñe* from *pälk[(a)]-* Antigv. 'burn', and 3.sg.act. *plyañcän* from *plänk[(a)]-* Antigv. 'sell'. To be sure, the (irregular) intransitive antigrundverb of *spärk[(a)]-* Antigv. 'get lost, disappear' shows root-initial palatalization as well (3.pl.act. *ṣpärkeṃ*), whereas other antigrundverb subjunctives from roots with palatalizable root initial do not show initial palatalization (as *wik[(a)]-* Antigv. 'avoid'). On the other hand, many thematic subjunctive stems that are not part of an antigrundverb also do show initial palatalization, which is indeed what is diachronically expected, since the PIE thematic present usually had *e*-grade in the root. In sum, root-initial palatalization in these forms is again an inherited feature rather than a secondary marker of transitivity.

Finally, the highly irregular subjunctive stem *kyānā-* of the Kausativum I of *kän[(a)]-* 'fulfill (a wish)' is also a special case that has to be explained diachronically; on the root see chap.s Pt II 8.2.3. and Sub I/V 18.3.1. in detail.

Root-initial palatalization is also sometimes attested with *s*-preterits, though, as is argued in chap. Pt III, no apparent connection of palatalization and transitivity can be found in this case, and the occurrence of palatalization has, again, diachronic reasons.[28]

---

[28] A possible example of initial palatalization of a Class III preterit with causative semantics may come from *kau-* 'kill': Pt III *kauwa* 'I killed' vs.

As for the marking of kausativum forms in Tocharian A, I already noted above that no certain statement can be made about the accent, and that in Tocharian A root-initial palatalization is even less associated with transitivity or causativity than in Tocharian B. The only pattern where Tocharian A and B seem to show the same characteristics, as discussed by Winter, 1980b, 553ff. = 1984, 245ff. = 2005, 240ff., is that of root-initial palatalization in preterits of Class I: these forms are indeed overwhelmingly transitive and they regularly have a nasal present stem beside them. However, as is argued in detail in chap. Pt I 7.3.3., in theses cases root-initial palatalization is not a secondary morphological marker of transitivity, but due to an inherited pattern of (mostly transitive) PIE nasal presents standing beside (mostly transitive) root aorists.

To sum up, Tocharian B apparently developed initial accent as a marker of oppositional transitive/causative kausativum paradigms. In contrast, root-initial palatalization was no such synchronic marker.

4.7.   VALENCY AND VOICE

Voice in Tocharian like in many other languages has a double function. Voice alternation can be used to express valency alternation, i.e., the middle can function as anticausative. What is remarkable is that this anticausative function is a relatively rare function of the middle in Tocharian. Transitive verbs can show active/middle voice alternation with the middle having quite different functions. There are also many activa tantum or media tantum. The most interesting behavior with respect to voice is shown by intransitive verbs.

4.7.1. *Intransitive verbs and voice*

As for intransitive verbs, with the exception of Prs III/IV verbs (including the *pārāk^ä-* type) and Sub III verbs, they are overwhelmingly either activa tantum or media tantum. There are the following groups:

śauwwa, śauwa- 'I let kill' (thus WTG, 187, § 182). However, as is argued s.v. *kau-*, it is not completely certain that the forms in question are indeed *let-*causatives, and, on the other hand, *śauwwa, śauwa-* can also be analyzed as Pt II.

4.7.1.1. *Activa tantum*

4.7.1.1.1. With Prs I

i- 'go' (itr) (a+/a/-) (I+II/I+II/-) = ^A*i-* 'go' (itr) (a+/-/-) (I/-/-)
^A*käln-* 'resound' (itr) (a+/-/-) (I/-/-) = but in TB both voices
^A*tärm-* 'tremble, be agitated' (itr) (a+/-/-) (I/-/-)
nes- 'be' (itr) (a+/-/-) (I+II/I/-) = ^A*nas-* 'be' (itr) (a+/-/-) (I+II/I/-)
pälk- 'shine' (itr) (a/-/a) (I/-/I) = ^A*pälk-* 'shine, appear' (itr) (a/-/a) (I/-/I)
^A*pränk[?]-* 'restrain oneself' (itr) (a/-/-) (I/-/-)
^A*plu-* 'fly, soar' (itr) (-/-/a) (I/-/I)
^A*länk-* 'dangle' (itr) (a+/-/-) (I/-/-)
^A*säl^(a)-* 'fly, arise' (itr) (a+/-/-) (I/-/I) = but *säl^(a)-* 'fly, arise' (itr) (-/-/m)
sälp^{a?}- 'glow' (itr) (a+/-/a) (I+II/?/I) = ^A*sälp^a-* 'glow' (itr) (a/a/-) (I/V/I)
^A*suw^(a)-* /^A*swās^(a)-* 'rain' (itr) (a+/-/a) (I/V/I)
tsip[?]- 'dance' (itr) (a+/-/-) (I+II/-/-) = ^A*tsip[?]-* 'dance' (itr) (a/-/-) (I/-/-)
kāñm[?]- '± be merry' (itr) (a+/-/-) (IoII/IoIIoV/-)

4.7.1.1.2. With Prs II

kātk- 'rejoice' (itr) (a+/-/a) (II/II/I) = ^A*kātk-* 'rejoice' (itr) (a+/-/-) (II/-/-)
kery- 'laugh' (itr) (a+/-/-) (II/-/-)
cänk- 'please' (itr) (a/a/-) (II/IoII/-)
cämp- 'be able to' (itr) (a/a/a) (II/II/I) = ^A*cämp-* 'be able to' (itr) (a+/a/a) (II/II/III)
nāsk- 'bathe, swim' (itr) (a+/a/a) (II/II/I)
^A*pros-* 'feel ashamed' (itr) (a/-/-) (II/II/-)
plätk- 'overflow, develop, arise' (itr) (-/a/a) (II/I/III)
^A*miw^a-* 'shake, quake' (itr) (a/-/-) (II/V/-) = but in TB both voices
re(-sk)- 'flow' (itr) (a/-/-) (IIoIXa/-/-)
lyäk- 'lie' (itr) (a+/a/-) (II/II/-)
śāw- 'live' (itr) (a+/a/a) (II/II/I-VII) = ^A*śāw-* 'live' (itr) (a+/a/-) (II/II/I)
ṣäm- 'sit, remain' (itr) (a+/-/-) (II/-/-) = ^A*ṣäm-* 'sit, remain' (itr) (a/-/-) (II/-/-)
soy- 'become sated, satisfied' (itr) (a/a/a) (II/II/I)

4.7.1.1.3. With Prs V

nitt^(a)- 'collapse' (itr) (a/-/a) (IoV/V/I)
pärsk^(a)- 'be afraid' (itr) (a/a/a) (V/V/I)
suw^a- / *swās^a-* 'rain' (itr) (a+/a/a) (V/V/I) ~ ^A*suw^(a)-* /^A*swās^(a)-* (itr) (a+/-/a) (I/V/I)

4.7.1.1.4. With Prs VI

ālp^a- 'stroke' (itr) (a/a/-) (VI/V/-) = but ^A*ālp^a-* (-/-/m)
^A*kārp^(a)-* 'descend' (itr) (a+/-/a) (VI/V/I) ~ TB Prs IV
^A*klis^a-* 'sleep' (itr) (a/a/a) (VI/V/I) ~ *klänts^(a)-* 'sleep' (itr) (a/a/a) (XII/V/I)
sik^a- 'step, set foot' (itr) (a/a/-) (VI/V/-)
skāy^a- 'strive' (itr) (a+/a/-) (VI/V/-) = ^A*skāy^a-* 'strive' (itr) (a+/a/a) (VI/V/I)

4.7.1.1.5. With Prs VII (TB)
rätk^(ā?)- '± (a)rise' (itr) (a/-/-) (VII/-/-)

4.7.1.1.6. With Prs VII (TA)
^A lotk^(ā)- 'turn' (itr) (a/a/a) (VII/V/I) ~ TB Prs IV

4.7.1.1.7. With Prs VIII
plu- 'float, fly, soar' (itr) (a/a/a) (VIII/I/III) ~ *^A plu*- 'fly, soar' (itr) (-/-/a) (I/-/I)

4.7.1.1.8. With Prs VIII (TA)
^A trisk- 'sound, boom' (itr) (a/-/-) (VIII/-/-)
^A wärs- 'breathe' (itr) (a/-/-) (VIII/-/-)

4.7.1.1.9. With Prs IXa
āks^(ā)-'waken' (itr) (-/a/a) (IXa/V/I)
āl^(ā)-sk- 'be sick' (itr) (a+/-/-) (IXa/IX/-)
lāl- 'exert oneself' (itr) (a+/a/a) (IXa/IV/VII)
wäs- 'dwell, abide, live, lie down' (itr) (a+/a/a) (IXa/IV/VII)
sāt^(ā)-sk- 'exhale' (itr) (a+/-/-) (IXa/IX/-)

4.7.1.1.10. With Prs Xa
kli-n- 'be obliged to' (itr) (a/a/a) (Xa/IoII/III) = but *^A kli-n*- (itr) (a/m/-) (X/IoII/-)
yäp- 'enter, set (sun)' (itr) (a+/a/a) (I-Xa/I/III) = *^A yäw*- 'enter' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/-/III)
lä-n-t- 'go out, emerge' (itr) (a+/a/a) (Xa/?/VI) = *^A lä-n-t*- (itr) (a+/a/a) (VIII/II/VI)

4.7.1.1.11. With Prs XI
^A oks- 'grow, increase' (itr) (a+/-/a) (XI/-/I-V) = but in TB both voices

4.7.1.1.12. Prs XII
klänts^((ā))- 'sleep' (itr) (a/a/a) (XII/V/I) ~ *^A klis^(ā)*- 'sleep' (itr) (a/a/a) (VI/V/I)

4.7.1.1.13. No present attested
ausw^(ā)- '± cry, lament' (itr) (-/a/-) (-/V/-)
^A kāp^(ā)- 'well up, be greedy' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I)
^A kälk^(ā)- 'go' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I)
tāk^(ā)- 'be, become' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) = *^A tāk^((ā))*- (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I)
tär^(ā?)- '± stretch, reach out' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I)
naut^((ā))- 'disappear' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) ~ *^A nut^((ā))*- (itr) (-/m/-) (-/V/I)
^A plutk- '± arise' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/-/III)
mä(s)^?- 'go' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I+III)
r(·)w^(ā?)- '± despair, be ashamed' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I)

ᴬṣtār ᵃˀ- 'become tired' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I)
särp ˀ- 'beat (of the heart)' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/-/IoIII)
stäm⁽ᵃ⁾- 'stand' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) = *ᴬṣtäm⁽ᵃ⁾*- (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I)

4.7.1.2. *Media tantum*

4.7.1.2.1. With Prs II
käly- 'stand, be situated' (itr) (m+/-/-) (II/-/-) = *ᴬkäly*- (itr) (m+/-/-) (II/-/-)
perk ˀ- 'peer' (itr) (m/-/-) (II/-/-)
mān(t)s⁽ᵃ⁾-'be sorrowful' (itr) (m/m/m) (II-VI/II-V/I)
yärs- 'show respect, affection' (itr) (m/-/m) (II/II/I) = *ᴬyärs*- (itr) (m/m/m) (II/II/I)
ᴬwäs- 'don, wear' (itr/tr) (-/m/m) (II/IoV/III)

4.7.1.2.2. With Prs V
nān⁽ᵃ⁾- 'appear' (itr) (m/m/m) (V/V/I)
mäk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'run' (itr) (m/m/m) (V/V/I)
ᴬṣkit ᵃ- '± appear, seem' (itr) (m/-/-) (V/-/-)

4.7.1.2.3. With Prs VI
kwäs ᵃ- 'lament' (itr) (m/?/-) (VI/V/I)
mān(t)s⁽ᵃ⁾-'be sorrowful' (itr) (m/m/m) (II-VI/II-V/I)
mus⁽ᵃ⁾- 'rise, be pulled up' (itr) (m/-/-) (VI/-/I) = *ᴬmus ᵃ*- (itr) (m/-/m) (VI/-/I)
mrausk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'feel disgust' (itr) (m/m/m) (VI/V/I) = *ᴬmrosk⁽ᵃ⁾*- (itr) (m/-/m) (VII/V/I)
staukk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'swell' (itr) (m/-/-) (VI/-/I)

4.7.1.2.4. With Prs VII
klutk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'turn, become' (itr) (m/-/-) (VII/V/I)

4.7.1.2.5. With Prs VII (TA)
ᴬwāsk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'move, quake' (itr) (m/-/m) (VII/V/I)

4.7.1.2.6. With Prs VIII
tsāk- 'glow' (itr) (m/-/m) (VIII/-/III) = *ᴬtsāk*- (itr) (m/m/m) (VIII/IoII/III)

4.7.1.2.7. With Prs IXa
kän⁽ᵃ⁾- 'come about' (itr) (m/m/-) (IXa/I-III/III) = *ᴬkän*- (itr) (m/m/-) (VIII/III/0oIII)
treṅk- 'cling, stick' (itr) (m/m/m) (IXa/I/III) = *ᴬträṅk*- (itr) (m+/m/m) (VIII/I-VII/III)
tw ᵃ-/ *twās⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'shine' (itr) (m/-/-) (IXa/-/-)
wäs- 'don, wear' (itr/tr) (m/m/m) (IXa/I/III) ~ *ᴬwäs*- 'don, wear' (itr/tr) (-/m/m) (II/IoV/III)

4.7.1.2.8. With Prs Xa

täm- 'come into being' (itr) (m+/m/m) (Xa/III/III) = *ᴬtäm-* (itr) (m/m/m) (X/III/0)

yäk^a- 'be careless' (itr) (m/m/-) (Xa/VI/I) = *ᴬyäk^a-* (itr) (m/m/-) (X/VI/I)

4.7.1.2.9. With Prs XII

ᴬarṣaṣ-ⁱñ ñ- 'fit (clothes)' (itr) (m/-/-) (XII/-/-)

ārc(-^äñ ñ)- 'should, ought to' (itr) (m/-/-) (XII/-/-)

ᴬklop-ⁱñ ñ- 'express sorrow, lament' (itr) (m/-/-) (XII/-/-)

cele-ñ ñ- 'appear' (itr) (m/-/-) (XII/-/-)

ykāṃṣ-^äñ ñ- 'feel disgust' (itr) (m/-/-) (XII/XII/-)

wāsk^(a)- 'move, quake' (itr) (m/-/m) (XII/V/I) ~ *ᴬwāsk^(a)-* (itr) (m/-/m) (VII/V/I)

winā-ñ ñ- 'enjoy' (itr) (m/-/-) (XII/XII/-) = *ᴬwin-ⁱñ ñ-* 'enjoy' (itr) (m/m/-) (XII/XII/-)

ᴬśew-ⁱñ ñ- 'yawn' (itr) (m/-/-) (XII/XII/-)

ᴬs͜ u̯kaṣ-ⁱñ ñ- 'be happy' (itr) (m/-/-) (XII/-/-)

sklok-^äñ ñ- 'despair' (itr) (m/-/-) (XII/-/-)

skw-^äñ ñ- 'be happy' (itr) (m/-/-) (XII/XII/-)

4.7.1.2.10. No present attested

ᴬpew^{a?}- 'card' (itr) (-/-/m) (-/-/I)

yās^(a)- 'be excited' (itr) (-/-/m) (-/-/I)

yät^(a)- 'be decorated' (itr) (-/-/m) (-/-/I)

räk^(a)- 'extend oneself (over)' (itr) (-/m/-) (-/V/I)

wārw^{a?}- 'prod, urge oneself' (itr) (-/-/m) (-/-/I) = *ᴬwārp^{a?}-* (itr) (-/-/m) (-/-/I)

ᴬwek^a- 'fall apart, break' (itr) (-/m/m) (-/V/I)

suk[?]- 'hang down; hesitate' (itr) (-/m/-) (-/XII/-)

stin^a-sk- 'be silent' (itr) (-/m/-) (-/IX/-)

4.7.1.3. *Intransitive verbs with both voices*

miw^(a)- 'tremble, quake' is a special case. The active forms have the meaning 'shake, quake' (of natural phenomena), which seems to be the basic meaning. In Tocharian B, however, there are also middle forms attested, which are confined to a collocation with *pit* 'bile' and with a genitive of the undergoer, and this phrase has the meaning 'faint', a concept based on Indian medicine, see Schmidt, 1974, 120ff. *ᴬtsārt^{a?}-* 'weep' with a middle present stem and an active *ā*-preterit looks like the Prs III/IV pattern, but pace Schmidt, 1974, 33, fn. 2, a Class IV Prs, is philologically and morphologically impossible; the Prs is either of Class I or Class II. In any case, the root vowel met in TA *śert-* can by no means be a lautgesetzlich TA outcome (see the disussion s.v.

ᴬtsārtᵃ²-). Accordingly, this root is not a good witness for voice pattern. As for *läm⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬläm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sit', Tocharian A is activum tantum, while in Tocharian B there is one single middle form *lmāte*, attested in a monastery record, beside many other active forms.[29] As for *ᴬkātkᵃ-* 'arise', the only middle form is actually a restored one, and although it is a philologically cogent restoration, one may hesitate to accept it from a morphological point of view. Intransitive *ᴬyᵃ-* 'go, travel' (m/-/a) (X/-/I) is the equivalent of the activum tantum *iyᵃ-* 'go, travel' that also can have transitive valency with the meaning 'lead' without voice/stem alternation, see below 4.9.1. As for intransitive *ᴬwäl-* 'die' (m/m/a) (X/III/III), it will be argued below in 4.7.2. that this kind of middle inflection found with this unergative root in both the present and subjunctive stems is probably a secondary feature caused by analogical influence from semantically opposed *täm-* 'be born', an influence the Pt evidently has escaped. A special case is *plāk-* act. 'agree', 'receive agreement', mid. 'ask for permission' (itr) (a/a/m) (VIII/I/III). While the verb seems to be intransitive, there is a difference in meaning between active and middle forms, but no valency change.

No certain explanation for mixed voice pattern in intransitive paradigms can be found in the following cases: the once attested active form of *tinᵃ-* '± defile oneself' (beside a certain middle attestation) does not have much context, so it cannot be excluded that the verb is basically transitive and that the intransitivity of the middle form is just due to the anticausative function of the middle. No present form from *mauk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'refrain from, desist' (itr) (-/a/x) ~ *ᴬmukᵃ²-* 'desist' (itr) (-/-/a) is attested, so that it is possible that the present belonged to Class IV, in which case, however, the once attested middle preterit form would be irregular as well.

This leaves very few intransitive verbs with voice alternation:

---

[29] Adams, DoT, 654f. analyzed and translated the form in question as transitive one belonging to the kauativum, and the form is indeed not stative: PK Cp 32, 4: *saṅkrām wtetse lmāte* "le monastère s'est assis de nouveau" (Pinault, 1984a, 26); "le monastère ... s'est de nouveau installé" (Pinault, 1984a, 31); "became set up" (Adams, ²DoT, s.v. *ṣäm-*). Hence, *lmāte* indeed semantically rather belongs with the kausativum paradigm, which is reminiscent of the behavior of the two middle Ipv I forms *karsar* and *prutkar*, and of that of the middle forms from *ᴬᴮpyutk-* as well.

pruk[(a)]- 'jump, leap (away)' (itr) (x/-/a) (VI/-/I)
ān[(a)]-*sk*- 'breathe in' (itr) (x/-/-) (IXa/IX/-)
käm- 'come' (itr) (x/x/x) (Xa/II/III-VI)[30] = [A]*kum*- (itr) (x/x/-) (X/II/III)
[A]*kli-n*- 'be obliged to' (itr) (a/m/-) (X/IoII/-) = but activum tantum in TB.

śāw-/ [A]*śāw*- 'live' is an interesting case. The intransitive[31] grundverb paradigm is activum tantum in both languages. Beside the grundverb there is a kausativum attested in both languages that is also intransitive, but shows both active and middle inflection in Tocharian B (x/-/m) (IXa/-/IV) and only middle forms in Tocharian A (m/-/-) (VIII/-/-). No difference in meaning or function can be found between the different paradigms or voices. A similar case is *yu-* 'seek, aspire, turn towards' that has an intransitive kausativum paradigm (IXb/IXb/-) which is also attested in Tocharian A [A]*yu*[(a)]- Kaus. III 'aspire to, reach out for' (itr), where it stands beside a (likewise) intransitive grundverb with a slightly different meaning 'turn, incline towards'. The formal kausativum shows both active and middle inflection in Tocharian B, while in Tocharian A only active forms are attested. Hence, there is reason to believe that the formal kausativum has been detached from the former grundverb. On the complicated history of the root, see s.v. *yu-.*

In sum, the material suggests that intransitive verbs are over-whelmingly either activa or media tantum; voice alternation both within the same stem or within the paradigm is only attested occasionally. The question that arises now is, of course, what causes an intransitive verb in Tocharian to be activum or medium tantum, but this question is beyond the scope of this study. However, the following observations can be made: a convenient explanation would be to assume an opposition between unaccusative and unergative verbs. Such a strategy is, in fact, used for PIE verbal roots by Benedetti, 2002, 20ff., and Lazzeroni, 2002, 105ff., 2003, 165ff. and 2004, 139ff. (based mainly on Vedic). Their basic claim is that in PIE unergative verbs were activa tantum, unaccusative ones media tantum. It seems that typical unergative verbs such as verbs of motion like 'go', 'dance', or verbs of sound emission like 'resound', 'laugh', etc.

---

[30] The TB middle has the meaning 'zusammenkommen mit', whereas in TA there does not seem to be a semantic difference between active and middle forms (see Schmidt, 1974, 472ff.).

[31] The verb is basically intransitive, but can be correlated in a figura etymologica with *śaul*/ TA *śol* 'life' in both grundverb and kausativum, cf. below 4.10.3. in the main text.

indeed prevail in the activa tantum class of Tocharian. On the other hand, there also seem to be typical unaccusative verbs in this class such as *lyäk-* 'lie', *ṣäm-* 'sit'. The same is true for the media tantum group where we have typical unergative verbs such as *mäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'run' as well.

4.7.2. *Simple voice alternation denoting valency alternation*

As in many other languages, alternation of voice can be used to denote valency change in Tocharian. As can also be observed crosslinguistically, it is the active that correlates with transitive valency and the middle with intransitive valency, i.e., the Tocharian middle can have anticausative function.[32]

Since the middle as marker of anticausatives is crosslinguistically often attested and this function was also most likely a property of the middle already in PIE (cf. Villanueva Svensson, 2003, 21ff.), it must be pointed out that valency alternation by simple voice alternation within the same verbal stem formation is not a common feature in Tocharian. On the contrary, it seems confined to a special set of roots that share some basic semanto-syntactic and morphological traits, above all causative alternation on the one hand[33] and the occurrence of Sub III forms (which are exclusively middle) on the other hand. Within the paradigms made from these roots, valency alternation denoted by simple voice alternation is then again restricted to the respective present stems of Tocharian B and two of the respective

---

[32] Strangely enough, there are also some verbs in Tocharian where the middle is linked with transitive valency and the active with intransitive valency, see the discussion in chap. Voice 5.2.2.

[33] To be honest, ᴬ*näm-* seems not to behave like a typical causative alternation verb, in that the active of its *s*-present is attested in intransitive use only, and the same must be said of the nasal infix present TA = TB *rämnā-*, which probably is to be derived from a cognate pre-PT *nämna-. Note, however, that according to Peters, forthcoming, even the active paradigms of the *s*-presents were based on pre-PT 3.sg. *middle* forms of root aorists, and that also some among the active paradigms of the nasal present Class VI are rather to be derived from respective pre-PT *middle* paradigms.

present stems of Tocharian A,[34] and to (most of) the respective preterit stems of Tocharian B:[35]

	Prs tr	Prs itr	Sub tr	Sub itr	Pt tr	Pt itr
kän⁽ä⁾- 'occur'; 'fulfill'	Prs IXb (a)	Prs IXa (m)	Sub V (m) *kyānamar* (Sub I m)?	Sub III (m) (Sub I m)?	Pt II (a)	Pt III (-)
ᴬ*kän-* 'id.'	Prs VIII (a+)	Prs VIII (m)	Sub IX (a)	Sub III (m)	Pt II (a)	Pt 0/III (-)
käs- 'come to extinction'; 'extinguish'	Prs II (a)	Prs II (m)	Sub I (-)	Sub III (m)	Pt III (a)	Pt III (m)
ᴬ*käs-* 'id.'	—	—	—	Sub III (-)	Pt II (m)	Pt 0/III (-)
täm- 'be born'; 'beget'	Prs Xb (x)	Prs Xa (m+)	Sub Xb (m)	Sub III (m)	Pt IV (-)	Pt III (m)
ᴬ*täm-* 'id.'	Prs X (a)	Prs X (m)	Sub IX (m)	Sub III (m)	Pt IV (m)	Pt 0 (m)
näk- 'destroy'; 'disappear'	Prs VIII (a)	Prs VIII (m)	Sub I + II (a)	Sub III (m)	Pt III (a)	Pt III (m)
ᴬ*näk-* 'id.'	Prs VIII (a)	Prs X (m)	Sub I (a)	Sub III (m)	Pt III (a)	Pt 0 (m)
näm- 'bend'; 'bow'	Prs VIII (a)	Prs VIII (m)	Sub I (-)	Sub III (m)	Pt III (a) Pt II (-)	Pt III (m)

---

[34] In the subjunctive, however, the standard pattern is the following: active-only transitive Sub I vs. middle-only intransitive Sub III.

[35] In the following list I also include one single root that does not really belong to that small group of unaccusative (causative alternation) verbs at all, because it also forms a Sub III (and a Prs X), viz. the unergative root ᴬ*wäl-* 'die'. It is an obvious guess that this root, from which was formed a completely irregular zero-grade active Pt III (3.sg. *wläs*), took on Prs X and Sub III forms just secondarily, viz. under the influence of its antonym ᴬ*täm-* 'be born'.

	Prs tr	Prs itr	Sub tr	Sub itr	Pt tr	Pt itr
ᴬ*näm*- 'bow'	—	Prs VIII (a+)	—	Sub V (-) Sub IX (-)	—	Pt I (-) Pt II (-) Pt III (-)
päk- 'ripen'; 'cook'	Prs VIII (a)	Prs VIII (m)	—	Sub III (-)	—	Pt III (-)
ᴬ*päk*- 'id.'	Prs VIII (p)	Prs X (m)	—	Sub III (-)	—	Pt 0 (m)
ru- 'open'	—	Prs VIII (m)	Sub I (a)	Opt (m)	Pt III (-)	—
ᴬ*ru*- 'id.'	Prs VIII (a)	—	—	—	—	—
ᴬ*wäl*- 'die'	—	Prs X (m)	—	Sub III (m)	—	Pt III (a)
tsäk- 'burn'	Prs VIII (a)	Prs VIII (m)	Sub I (-)	Sub III (m)	Pt III (a)	Pt III (m)
ᴬ*tsäk*- 'id.'	Prs VIII (a)	Prs X (m)	—	Sub III (-)	—	Pt 0 (m)

Lane, 1953, 494 and Schmidt, 1974, 62f. pointed out that Tocharian A is more prone to denote valency alternation by stem formation than Tocharian B. This is most conspicuous in the preterit, while in the present Tocharian B also shows stem alternation, notably between a normal *(nä)sk*-present (Prs IXa, Xa) and a *(nä)sk*-present with initial accent (Prs IXb, Xb). Since the intransitive and normally accented Prs IXa and Xa forms seem also confined to the middle (while the kausativum Prs IXb and Xb can show both voices), it is likely that a formerly voice-alternating present stem was secondarily replaced by a kausativum stem marked with initial accent (that could then also take on middle forms without the danger of confusion with an intransitive middle anticausative). Tocharian A shows a parallel development in having a transitive active Prs VIII[36] vs. intransitive middle Prs X (ᴬ*näk*-, ᴬ*päk*-, ᴬ*tsäk*-).

---

[36] Note, however, that the transitive Prs VIII of ᴬ*päk*- has a middle form in passive function: the 3.pl.mid. Imp TA *päkṣānt* can only have passive meaning 'were cooked (by someone)' (not 'boiled, ripened'). One of the two middle forms attested of the Prs X stem is intransitive (Imp TA *pkämṣānt* in A

4.7.2.1.   *Remarkable forms*

käs- is a special case, because though it synchronically seems to be a simple thematic present stem with voice/valency alternation, Jasanoff, most recently, 2008, 159 plausibly argues that we are dealing with a former *s*-present that underwent simplification of etymologically expected *-ss-*.

^Anäm^(ä)- 'bow' has an intransitive active Prs VIII, and three different PPt formations that all seem to have the same intransitive meaning. In addition, the root is also peculiar inasmuch as there is a Class V subjunctive stem attested as well, even though the other roots in question do not have A-character. If the etymological derivation from synonymous *räm^ä*- 'bow' as being based on a nasal present stem *nämnā- > *rämnā*- is correct (as proposed by Melchert apud Adams, DoT, 531), we have another indication that the root had A-character in Proto-Tocharian. The paradigm of the root *kän^(ä)*- descriptively deviates from the general pattern even more than the one of the root *näm*-. Diachronically, the aberrant behavior of these two roots is easily explained, since the PIE > pre-PT ancestors of both roots had ended in a laryngeal, which had to develop into a PT *ā in certain contexts, so that there could exist stem allomorphs from these two roots in PT *-ā- that would have to look much the same as stem allomorphs ending in suffixal PT *-ā- and would have to be assigned to the familiar pattern characterized by a Pt I and a Sub V ending in suffixal PT *-ā-.

A behavior quite similar to the one of the Sub III verbs discussed in this paragraph is found with the antigrundverb paradigm from the root *luk^(ä)*-/ *^Aluk*- 'light up, be illuminated'. It has an intransitive grundverb (III/V/I) in Tocharian B, and beside that also intransitive middle forms of present Class VIII and preterit Class III, which can easily be explained as cases of middles in anticausative function. However, note that the corresponding antigrundverb 'illuminate' (VIII/II/III) also has middle forms that are transitive, i.e., have non-anticausative middle function. In other words, the middle *s*-present can be intransitive 'light up' or transitive 'illuminate for oneself'. In Tocharian A, beside the transitive antigrundverb the only certain intransitive form is the middle root preterit.

With respect to semantics, this group of verbs seems to consist of quite typically causative alternation verbs: 'come to extinction' vs. 'fall into ruin, disappear', 'cook, ripen', 'open', 'burn', 'sprout', etc. It is

---

222 a 3f., see Schmidt, 1974, 135), the second is unclear (TA *päknäṣtr-äṃ* in A 124 b 6, see Schmidt, 1974, 265f.).

therefore not too surprising that valency change can indeed be expressed by mere voice alternation. Since, furthermore, anticausative was not the only function of the middle, it is also understandable that stem alternation for expressing valency change is the more productive kind of formation in Tocharian, and secondary marking of oppositional middles by stem formation is indeed precisely attested for these roots as well (notably in the TA present stem formations of Class X, and, I think, the same process may just underlie the Sub III formation itself, see chap. Sub III).

4.8.   DOUBLE MARKING OF VALENCY ALTERNATION BY VOICE AND STEM FORMATION

There are just three stem formations in Tocharian that show a double characterization of both stem formation and voice, viz. oppositional intransitive stems that are also media tantum. These are present Class III and IV stems (being the prototypical intransitive grundverb present stems of triple roots), the subjunctives of Class III (being the intransitive subjunctive of the type *päk-*), and, confined to Tocharian A, intransitive middle root preterits beside transitive active Class III preterits, which are to be found both in paradigms having a Sub III or a Prs III. At first glance, it does not seem odd that intransitive stems are media tantum. However, the linking of a certain stem formation and voice with valency is singular to just these three stem formations. Note further that the respective oppositional transitive stems are not likewise linked with active voice in turn. The oppositional transitive *s*-present (of the antigrundverb) or *sk*-present (of the kausativum) beside present Classes III and IV can be middle, and at least the *s*-present can itself show voice alternation to express valency alternation (e.g., ^{AB}*wāk*$^{(ä)}$- grundverb 'split apart, bloom', antigrundverb act. 'split', mid. 'differ'). In the case of Class III subjunctives, *kantär* may be one example of a middle form from the oppositional transitive stem (Class I or II),[37] and there are certainly middle forms attested in the secondary subjunctive stems of Class Xb in Tocharian B and Sub IX in Tocharian A.

 The next question is, of course, and one that is highly important for the diachronic explanation of all of these classes: why is this kind of stem formation synchronically linked with middle voice at all? Did they acquire middle inflection because they were confined to

---

[37] On 3.sg. *kantär* see the discussion in chap. Sub III 20.1.3.

oppositional intransitives, or did they become oppositional intransitives because they were medium tantum? These questions are discussed in the respective chapters on Prs III/IV, Sub III, and Pt 0.

4.9.   VALENCY CHANGE WITHOUT VOICE OR STEM MARKING

There are very few examples to be found of valency alternation within the very same stem without voice alternation.

4.9.1. *iy^ā- 'go, travel', 'lead, cause to go' (itr/tr)*

The TA equivalent *^Ay^ā-* is only attested as an intransitive with the meaning 'go, travel' (there are both middle and active forms attested), and this is also the overwhelming sense of the TB verb, which is activum tantum.[38] One single TB form, however, is most likely transitive in the sense of 'lead, cause to go':

2 b 8 + 3 a 1 *ontsoyttñesa alloṅkna retke iyaṃ ypaunane māka wnolme(ṃ) kauseṃ* "Wenn (die Könige) aus Unersättlichkeit das Heer in andere Länder führen, töten sie viele Wesen" as translated by TochSprR(B), transl., 5. That *lānte* is the (missing) first part of the line and hence the subject is indeed quite plausible due to another parallel found in 1 b 8, as per TochSprR(B), s.v. 1 b 8.[39]

4.9.2. *^ABkätk^(ä)- 'cross, pass' (tr/itr)*

The grundverb paradigm from this root can be used both transitively and intransitively; if there is any complement denoting a locality vel sim. at all, it stands either in the obliquus or in the perlative, as per Carling, 2000, 67f., fn. 193: "Die Grundbedeutung von *kätk-* ist 'überschreiten', das mit einem Objektsobliquus konstruiert wird. Mit B *ytārye* [...] wird aber B *kätk-* mit einem Perlativ kombiniert, und die Bedeutung muß hier eher 'schreiten, passieren' sein". Intransitive use

---

[38] 5 a 2 *kokaletstse īyoy sū prasenacī walo ot* "Es kam zu Wagen einhergefahren (wtl. als einer, der einen Wagen hat) der König Prasenajit" (Thomas, 1957, 35); often in caravan travel passports (see Pinault, 1987, 190) in the sense of 'pass'. A 29 b 6 *(ä)ntanene jambudvip tämne yā āñcā* //// "where Jambudvīpa (was), he went there ..."; A 379 b 3 *yā puk śäk kälymne(ntwaṃ)* "he went in the ten directions" (Winter, 1988, 781 = 2005, 335).

[39] However, as W. Winter (p.c.) pointed out to me, it cannot be excluded that *retke* is, in fact, the subject of the sentence.

is attested (a) correlated with perlative (only in Tocharian B) in: 29 b 4 *(t)āk ytārisa poyśinta kätkanaṃ tāksa arhānti* "nur auf diesem Wege überschreiten die Alleswissenden, auf diesem die Arhats" (TochSprR(B), transl., 49; cf. Carling, 2000, 94). (b) Absolutely used in 3 a 2 *mäkte śaul (kä)ttaṅkäṃ* "wie das Leben vergeht"; 3 a 4 *mant kättaṅkäṃ* (sic) *śaulanma* "so gehen die Leben vorüber" (TochSprR(B), transl., 5).

In Tocharian A we have: A 18 a 3 *oktuk antarakalpañ kätkeñc sas mahākalp* "Wenn achtzig Antarakalpas vergehen, ist es ein Mahākalpa" (Sieg, Übers. I, 22); A 295 a 8 = YQ 36 b 4 *käntantuyo puklā kätkeñc* "by the hundreds the years will pass"; similarly A 409 a 3 *puklā kätkeñc* "the years will pass". Here A 288 a 5 may also belong, which Schmidt, 1974, 476 restored and translated:[40] *(śäk ṣpä)t-pi koris ṣäk-känt (tmāṃ puklā kupre)ne kätkeñc kātka(ṣ säm) ārkiśoṣṣaṃ pättāñkät* "(Wenn 176 Millionen Jahre) vergangen sind [wörtl. vergehen], wird er [scil. Maitreya] sich in der Welt als Buddha erheben".[41] The proposal by TG, 428 to restore TA *(kä)tkeñc* in A 284 a 2 can now be confirmed by the Old Turkish parallel (identified by Pinault, 1999, 203f.) MaitrSäŋim, Blatt 6 recto: "(wenn 57 Koṭi mal 6 000 000 Jahre der Menschen ver)gehen, [so] ist dies in der Raurava-Hölle gerade mal ein Tag und eine Nacht" (Geng/Klimkeit/Laut, 1998, 118); consequently, the TA passage 284 a 2 *////(kä)tkeñc täṃ raurāpaṃ koṃ wṣe mäska(tär)* must be translated: "(when ... years pa)ss, it is in the Raurava-[Hell] one single day and one single night". Similarly YQ 2 a 4 ~ A 214 a 1 *śtwar tmāṃ tri wälts we känt wṣeñ katkar* "43,200 nights have gone by" (Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 68f.); A 305 b 2 *(kṣaṇa)ñ ñi täpreṃ āptā mā katkar kosne tñi* "(hast du verstanden, Śaṅkha, daß) mir nicht so viele (Augenblick)e, (die ich in drei Asaṃkheyas [und] hundert Kalpas gelitten habe), vergangen sind wie dir?" (translation and restoration according to Schmidt, 1994b, 267 with fn. 175; according to Pinault, 2004, 2f., however, TA *āptā* rather has the meaning "früher").

Transitive use in Tocharian B we have in the following cases: 36 b 4 *(kä)tknaṃ träṅkonta* "they commit sins"; Dd 6,2,4 *su kätkāṣtär*

---

[40] Note that a similar restoration was already proposed by W. Siegling (pers. copy).

[41] Cf. the Old Turkish parallel MaitrHami I, 20ff. (as per Pinault, 1999, 193): "wenn (bei) jenen [Menschen] 56 Millionen [Jahre] vergehen, wenn der B[odhisattva] Maitreya auf dieser Erde erschienen ist" (as translated by Geng/Klimkeit, 1988, 77).

ypomna k̂uṣaiṃ ṣpä "he passes through lands and villages" (cf. Pinault, 1987, 184f.); PK NS 107 a 1 *k̂use kätkana(ṃ) sammuttä* "welche den Ozean durchqueren" (Thomas, 1977, 105); PK NS 107 a 2 *(mā cai) kätkana(ṃ) m(a)k(a)lñe* "sie überqueren den Fluß nicht" (Thomas, 1977, 107). In Pratimokṣa texts *kätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* often translates Skt. *adhyā √*pad 'hineingeraten in (schuldhaftes Handeln); sich vergehen (gegen)', see Schmidt, 1986, 182 (such as *kätk⁽ᵃ⁾- īke* = Skt. *adhyā √*pad *sthānam* "vergehen gegen diesen Punkt"). A similar meaning we seem to have in 333 a 8 *kwri mā katkat peparku poñ •* "if asked you do not get into (culpable behavior), [thus] speak". Similarly 608 a 2 //// *ymar taññe yaitkor katkat(s)i* "I ... offended (against) your order"; 355 b 4 //// *nest kerekauna k(a)tkatsi* "you are ... to pass through the flood"; 29 a 7 *mäktāu ytārisa makte śätkāwa cmelṣe samudtär* "Auf welchem Wege ich selbst überschritt das Meer der Geburt" (TochSprR(B), transl., 48); 247 a 2 *śano warñai śanmanma śakse warñai kleśanma śatka(sta)* "Die Fesseln Frau usw. [und] die Kleśas Branntwein usw. hast (du) überschritten" (Thomas, 1957, 176); 429 a 2 *(vid)yāsthāntaṣṣe śatka samudtär* "he crossed the sea of learning"; PK AS 18B b 1f. *y<u>māne lykaśkana śikṣapātäntats <ts>amo śitkāre* "[Dadurch, daß sie] zugänglich [waren], haben sie das Gedeihen der kleinen Śikṣapadas [Moralvorschriften] außer acht gelassen" (Thomas, 1985, 91f.; 1987a, 90f.; cf. Pinault, 2008, 77).

Transitive use in Tocharian A we have in the following cases: A 1 b 6 + A 2 a 1 *māski kätkāläṃ ktäṅkeñc tsraṣiñ samuddrä • traidhātuk saṃs(ār tsra)ṣṣuneyo ktäṅkeñc kraṃś* "Den schwer überschreitbaren Ozean überschreiten die Energischen, die dreiteilige Welt überschreiten die Guten durch Energie" (Sieg, Übers. I, 4); A 150 a 1 *kusn(e) ptāñäktaśśi mrāc lap cämpi(ṣ ā)suk ktäṅkātsi* "whoever may be able to cross the top of the Buddha's head"; A 355 b 1 *ymassuṣ wrasañ pāsanträ saṃvarṣi slyi mā ktäṅkāñc* (sic, for *ktäṅkeñc*) *eṅkäl ṣurmaṣ* "Verständige Wesen wahren die Regel des Saṃvara [und] überschreiten [sie] nicht aus Leidenschaft" (Schmidt, 1974, 405); A 256 a 4 *āpas pācräśśi śaśmunt slyi cam mar katkat* "Die von den Ahnen [und] Vätern aufgestellte Regel, die überschreite nicht!" (Geng/Laut/Pinault, 2004a, 55); A 374, 8 *kāswone āsuk kätkāc* "you surpass virtue"; A 1 b 3 *tmäṣ śtwar wäknā ārṣlāsyo rarkuñcäs iṣanäs kcäk* "Dann überschritt er die vierfachen mit Schlangen bedeckten Festungsgräben" (Sieg, Übers. I, 4; according to Lane, 1947, 37, TA *śtwar wäknā* is correlated with TA *ārṣlāsyo* 'snakes'); A 155 b 2 *kārāś katkar* "they crossed the wood"; A 395 b 2 *tämyo cam kausalṣiṃ wärt*

āssuk mā katkar "Darum durchschritten sie den Kausala-Wald nicht weiter" (Thomas, 1957, 127); YQ 38 a 5 *śäk karmapatäntu ktäṅkānträ* "they trespass the ten karmapathas" (for 11 a 4 see Schmidt, 1974, 264f.; Winter, 2001, 131); fragmentary are 247 a 1, 425 a 2 and 379 a 4; A 203 b 5, A 82 b 4, YQ 28 a 2; YQ 29 b 7f.

4.9.3. *Basically transitive media tantum acting as reflexive middles*

According to Schmidt, 1974, 304ff., a couple of basically transitive verbs which are all media tantum can also have reflexive meaning without morphological alteration. His examples are *kraup$^{(ä)}$-/^{A}krop$^{(ä)}$-* 'gather; gather oneself', *pāsk-/^{A}pās-* 'protect; beware of'; *^{A}yät-* 'adorn; adorn oneself'; *wlāw^{ä}-* 'control; restrain oneself'.

For example, *wlāw^{ä}-* 'control', 'control, restrain oneself' is attested two times with *palsko* 'thinking' as direct object: H 149.290 b 1 //// *ksa palsko mā wlāwatär taisa te oko w(ä)rpanatär* "[wenn] einer sein Denken nicht beherrscht, so genießt er dies [als] Frucht [davon]" (Schmidt, 1974, 352); A(Ud.) 1 (= PK AS 6B) b 5 *keklyauṣormeṃ mrauskāte mamrauskau wlawāte palsko* "auf Grund des Gehörten empfand er [scil. Nanda] Überdruß, [und] überdrüssig geworden, beherrscht er sein Denken" (Schmidt, 1974, 352). On the other hand, reflexive use and correlation with an ablative is attested in S 3 (= St. Ch. 00316.b) a 5f.: *kektseñ reki palskosa ṣek wlāwoymar anaiśai duścaritmeṃ* "in Körper, Wort [und] Gedanken möge ich mich immer sorgfältig vom üblen Wandel zurückhalten" (translation according to Kölver, 1965, 144; transliteration according to Thomas, 1966a, 167, cf. also Pinault, 1990a, 64). Similarly 243 b 4 *po wlawātai anaiśai kaccāp ram no ṣañ lyñā ////* "you were completely (and) carefully covered/locked in (= contained) like a tortoise in its own shell (?)" (Hilmarsson, 1991, 44). In Tocharian A, only the abstract TA *wlāwlune* is attested.

4.10. FORMATIONS INDEPENDENT OF THE BASIC VALENCY OF THE STEM?

According to TEB I, the imperative (183, § 313,2) and the infinitive (184, § 314,4) of basically intransitive grundverb stems can be transitive ("kausativisch").

4.10.1. *The imperative*

From the examples given in TEB for transitive *ā*-imperatives of Class I only two are indeed examples of such a phenomenon, whereas the others can be interpreted differently. The TB example *pätrīwa-ne* 'mix it!' is rather to be analyzed as an Ipv of Class II, and not as Ipv I, see the discussion in chap. Ipv. As for the TA example, TA *pkanā-ñi* 'fulfill my (wish)!' is a special problem. The form can be analyzed as Ipv III, and since *ᴬkän-* 'fulfill' belongs to the group of verbs characterized by an intransitive subjunctive Class III, the corresponding active preterit of Class III can belong to the kausativum (cf. *ᴬnäk-*). The only certain examples among the Ipv I forms said to have the semantics of kausativum forms in TEB are the 2.pl.act. Ipv I *pwīkaso* and the 2.sg.mid. *karsar* 'make known' beside the 2.sg.act. Ipv I *pkārsa* 'know!'. A third form of this kind is, I think, provided by *prutkar* in H 149.26/30 (= IOL Toch 5) b 1, as per Krause, WTG, 32, § 26,2: *karuṇaṣṣe troṅk prutkar* "Erfülle die Mitleidhöhle!"; similarly recently Pinault, 2008, 324 who suggests a development "probablement par l'intermédiaire d'un sujet indéfini: 'qu'on se remplisse!'".[42] As is argued in chap.s Pt I, Sub I/V, Prs/Sub IX, and Ipv, these forms can be regarded as archaisms pointing to "causative" *ā*-stems.

In order to offer an explanation, Krause, 1960, 149 referred to the well-known fact that at least in the Attic dialect of Ancient Greek the 2.sg.act. present imperative παῦε can be used both in the causative meaning quite typical of active παύειν 'to stop (somebody from doing something)' and in the anticausative meaning otherwise (at least before the 3rd century BC) restricted to the middle παύεσθαι 'to stop (doing something)'. Since Wackernagel, 1920, 122 it has been customary to regard this as an archaism going back to PIE times, assuming that imperative forms consisting of the pure verbal stem only, precisely for that reason had been indifferent to valency (and also number) in the proto-language. Basing himself on Wackernagel as well, Schmidt, 1974, 24ff. also tried to explain the 2.sg. imperative

---

[42] In contrast, Couvreur, 1954, 87 doubted that the form is imperative: "[d]er Satzzsammenhang […] zeugt nicht unbedingt für eine Imperativgeltung." However, there are indeed some Ipv forms in this confessionary text by which the Buddha seems to be addressed directly (see Weber, 1999, 157). On the other hand, the analysis as 3.pl. Pt by Couvreur's pupil Broomhead I, 187 is excluded for syntactic reasons, because *troṅk* is a singular.

forms *peṅksa* 'seize!' from the medium tantum root *eṅk-/ ᴬemts-* 'seize' and *päccauk* 'hide!' belonging semantically to the middle-only kausativum paradigm from the root *tuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'hide oneself' by the very same principle, as with respect to morphology he took them for old active forms. This is, however, quite unlikely, because the *-s-* in *peṅksa* clearly indicates that what we have here is an old middle form, viz. *peṅksar*, which by irregular sound change had lost the final *-r*; as for *päccauk*, this form must have undergone an irregular weakening/truncation of its final syllable at any rate, and therefore can also be derived from an old regular middle form in *-ār.

As a matter of fact, Méndez Dosuna, 2006 argued that the anticausative use of παῦε (and also of ἔγειρε) found in Attic Greek was merely due to a rather recent inner-Attic innovation, and that there is absolutely no reason for assuming that in PIE any kind of endingless form and/or imperative form could have been indifferent to valency (or number), simply by its very nature of being an endingless and/or imperative form.

Therefore, we should rather assume that the causative use of the three imperative forms *karsar*, *prutkar*, and *pwīkaso* had something to do with their property of belonging to a stem that ended in a suffixal pre-PT *ā → PT *ā, because quite the same phenomenon is met with a non-imperative form from the stem *iyā-*, which also must have ended in suffixal pre-PT *ā → PT *ā (see above 4.9.1.).

4.10.2.   *The infinitive*

Thomas, 1954, 712 states: "Gelegentlich scheint es auch möglich, einen Inf. des Grundverbs in kausativischem Sinn zu verwenden". A number of examples have been put forward in support of such a claim:

mrauskatsi-ś (sic) in 5 a 7: *l(ā)nte palsko mrauskatsi-ś* "um den Geist des Königs von der Welt abzuwenden" (TochSprR(B), transl., 10). It is indeed extremely unlikely that this form belongs to a Sub I of an antigrundverb paradigm, so the form is a Sub V showing root-initial accent, see the detailed discussion in chap. Sub V 18.3.2. On the other hand, *tsälpātsi-ś* in 30 a 6 can also be intransitive if restored *(emṣke)tse* is the subject of the sentence: *(emṣke)tse läklentameṃ tsälpātsi-ś oktatsa klyomña* "the world is released from suffering by the Eightfold Way". As for the third example listed by the manuals, *waimene sklok wikātsi* in 127 b 6 "[es ist] schwierig, Zweifel zu vertreiben" may also be interpreted as "[it is] difficult [for] doubt to

disappear" (as per Adams, DoT, 599). Finally, TEB I, 184, § 314,4 adds the TA example A 430 a 3 *war* (sic) *wipāsi lywā-ṃ* "Wasser zum Naßmachen schickte sie ihm" for a grundverb formation with the meaning of a "Kausativum", and Thomas, 1954, 729 with fn. 144 is certainly correct in stating that the meaning here is rather 'moisten' than 'feucht sein' as per TG, 472, but one can hardly rule out the possibility that *wipāsi* rather denoted 'zum Feuchtwerden', 'in order to get wet'.

4.10.3.   *Figura etymologica*

Two basically intransitive verbs can be constructed with an abstract noun derived from the same root in a figura eymologica, which is a phenomenon that can be observed crosslinguistically, e.g., in Greek, where such a construction is called "Akkusativ des Inhalts", cf. Schwyzer, Gr.Gram. II, 74ff., 218f. The respective roots are *āks^ä-* 'waken' and ^AB*śāw-* 'live'.

All attestations of *āks^ä-* 'waken' are devoid of any obliquus complement except S 4 (= PK AS 4A) b 4f.: *krent āksalñe ṣek ā(ks)oym* "ein gutes Erwachen möchte ich stets erwachen" (Couvreur, 1947, 150, fn. 3; Pinault, 1990a, 65); here the verb is correlated with the abstract *āksalñe* derived from its subjunctive stem.

^AB*śāw-* 'live' is also basically intransitive, but can be constructed with *śaul*/TA *śol* 'life' both in the grundverb and the likewise intransitive Kausativum III paradigm.

As can be expected, there exist also other kinds of figurae etymologicae, such as *koyn kāy^ä-* 'open the mouth', *newe nu^(ä)-* 'cry a cry', and *wäs- wastsi* 'put on garment'.

4.10.4.   *Directional obliquus with verbs of motion*

Basically intransitive verbs of motion can be construed with an obliquus indicating direction, see Thomas, 1983, 9ff. Quite obviously, the obliquus in such constructions is to be derived from a PIE accusative or locative of direction; note also the fact that the same verbs can alternatively be construed with allative, perlative, or locative forms in the same sense, see the survey by Carling, 2000, passim for details. The same construction, according to Thomas, 1983, 14ff., also underlies a phrase such as *pintwat i-* "den Almosengang gehen".

4.11. Kausativum III

A kausativum paradigm, i.e., a second or third paradigm by definition consisting of *sk*-present/subjunctive forms and a Class II or IV preterit, does not automatically have a valency different from that of the respective grundverb.[43] In this study kausativum paradigms having the same valency as the grundverb are called Kausativa III. Usually, in these cases we have a transitive grundverb and a likewise transitive kausativum, which is, however, not a causative of the grundverb, and can sometimes show the very same meaning as the grundverb, as is the case with *täl(ä)-* Gv. 'carry, bear', Kaus. III 'lift up, carry'. More often the Kausativum III shows a slightly different meaning, as is the case with *ārt(t)(ä)-* Gv. 'be pleased with, love, praise', Kaus. III 'acknowledge; rejoice in'. There are even two kausativa paradigms attested that have intransitive valency just like the grundverb: the respective roots are: *śāw-/^Aśāw-* 'live' and *yu-* 'seek, aspire' (in TB only the kausativum is attested)/ *^Ayu(ä)-* Gv. 'turn, incline towards', Kaus. III 'reach out, aspire to', both usually construed with the allative. As for the latter, see the discussion s.v. *yu-/^Ayu(ä)-*.

What is not attested is an intransitive kausativum beside a transitive grundverb.

---

[43] This can also be observed in other languages. For non-causative verbs with causative morphology in Semitic languages, see Zaborski, 2007, 32ff.

VOICE

Every finite[1] verbal form of Tocharian has either active or middle voice, i.e., has an ending that belongs either to the set of the so-called active or to the set of the so-called middle endings, and the same also holds for the finite verbal forms of PIE.

As is obvious, by this I define the concept of "middle", which can mean different things to different people, in purely morphological terms.[2] As for the grammatical/semantic function(s) of the Tocharian grammatical category "middle", with regard to the main purpose of this book the most important aspect is probably that Tocharian middle forms can be, but actually are only quite rarely, used in anticausative function, i.e., in order to denote oppositional intransitivity. For a great part of the middle forms, however, and especially for the forms of middle-only paradigms, I at least can hardly make out any special semantic function being expressed.

5.1.   THE PIE MIDDLE

Reconstructing the function(s) of the PIE middle is especially difficult because there seem to exist two different sets of middle endings, the second being strongly reminiscent of the set of endings usually set up

---

[1] Note that the two present participles, i.e., the *nt-* and the *m*-participle do not have anything to do with voice in Tocharian, see chap. Prs Part.

[2] By my own definition, of course, even all modern IE languages of Europe would lack the category "middle", but actually there are scholars who would even claim that *opened* in the English sentence *The door opened* is a middle form, i.e., who define the concept of "middle" in purely *semantic* terms, such as, e.g., John Lyons (see Kemmer, 1993, 1). On the other hand, in the elementary studies by Klaiman, 1991 and Kemmer, 1993 (for which see also Allan, 2003, 42ff.), who rather try to stir a middle course, "middle" also gets first defined morphologically; see, e.g., the statement of Kemmer, 1993, 4: "I have concentrated on the subset of languages which have a formal marker (termed a *middle marker* or MM) used in the expression of some cluster of semantic categories fitting Lyons' description", which is that "the 'action' or 'state' affects the subject of the verb or his interests".

for the PIE active perfect, and often referred to by the term "stative" (despite the fact that most of the so-called "stative" forms actually do *not* have stative semantics at all). Villanueva Svensson, 2003, who wrote the most recent, detailed monograph on the PIE middle, is somewhat skeptical about the possibility of capturing the finer points of the functions attributed to the PIE middle at all. He nevertheless neatly discusses the more secure statements one can make about the PIE middle (p. 21ff.). According to him, the middle was certainly a distinct PIE category, transmitted to Hittite and to Tocharian as well; PIE had paradigms showing voice alternation, activa tantum, and media tantum; and the function of the middle that can safely be assumed on the evidence of ancient IE languages, namely Vedic, Avestan, Greek, Hittite, and also Tocharian was benefective,[3] reflexive, reciprocal, passive, and anticausative — actually, it has been shown in great detail by Schmidt, 1974, passim, that all of these PIE middle functions can indeed also be found in Tocharian.[4] Villanueva Svensson further claims that media tantum verbs in PIE largely seem to be verbs of movement and processes, verbs of bodily action, of emotion and of utterance, an observation he says is in accordance with insights of typology (for which he quotes the works of Klaiman, 1991 and Kemmer, 1993). The main conclusion to be drawn from these studies for PIE is, as per Villanueva Svensson, that PIE actually behaves precisely like a "normal" language.

---

[3] There are several terms for the middle expressing a special attachment of the subject, e.g., also "dynamic". Klaiman, 1991, 92 summarizes the function of the "IE differential middle", i.e., a middle that stands in opposition to an active, as follows: "the middle, in opposition to the active, encodes situations having principal effects upon the referent of the nominal which the verb assigns as subject".

[4] Schmidt worked with the traditional terms reflexive, reciprocal, dynamic (as per Delbrück, 1887, 425ff.), eventive (as per Gonda, 1960), and passive. In contrast to Schmidt, 1974, Dietz, 1981, 8ff. claims without further discussion that no PIE middle functions survived in Tocharian. Although the study by Dietz makes it perfectly clear that the present *participles* do not have any connection with voice in Tocharian, it is a severe misjudgment to draw from this fact any conclusions for the finite verbal forms. Neither can I follow the similar objections to Schmidt's conclusions by Thomas, 1999, 473ff.

5.2.   THE TOCHARIAN MIDDLE

According to the detailed survey by Schmidt, 1974, 7f., the percentage of finite middle forms in Tocharian A and B amounts to 33%, which he says is even the highest percentage of middle forms to be found in any ancient IE language. Schmidt distinguished the following subgroups of Tocharian middles: Eventives, reflexives, intensives, and passives.

The eventive "drückt aus, daß das Subjekt von einem Vorgang betroffen wird, ohne daß ein Agens impliziert wird", such as in the example A 89 b 1: *sām ayot rī puk tsakät nakä(t)* "die Stadt Ayodhyā verbrannte ganz [und] ging zugrunde" (Schmidt, 1974, 133) — of course, this is what I call anticausative use.

The reflexive "besagt, daß das Subjekt den Verbalvorgang in seiner Sphäre vollzieht oder daß der Verbalvorgang irgendwie auf das Subjekt zurückwirkt", e.g., A(Ud.) 1 a 6: *sonopitär līkṣītär wästsanma krenta yäṣṣitär* "er salbte sich, wusch sich [und] zog sich gute Kleider an" (Schmidt, 1974, 68).

The intensive "betont, daß das Subjekt den Verbalvorgang mit einer gefühlsmässigen (inneren, persönlichen) Beteiligung begleitet", as in A 382, 2: *cwaṃ ynānmūñyā cwaṃ wsokoñyā peke ptāñkte arä(mpāt)* "aus Wertschätzung zu dir, aus Freude zu dir habe ich die Gestalt des Buddha gemalt" (Schmidt, 1974, 457); here Schmidt also includes the so-called "spontane" middle with the meaning: "das Subjekt vollzieht die Verbalhandlung aus eigenem Antrieb" (Schmidt, 1974, 449 and 488, e.g., A 71 a 2: *mā nu ākāl knäṣtär-ñi* "Aber er erfüllt meinen Wunsch nicht [von sich aus]").

Finally, middle forms can be used as passives, see, e.g., 461, 5: *ñake ṣuktañce ṣkas meñantse meṃ monte ñwe-mape śātre śwātär* "jetzt, vom 7. des sechsten Monats ab, wird neues, reifes Getreide gegessen" (Schmidt, 1974, 68).

As far as I can judge from my own experience, generally speaking the middle of any relevant (i.e., transitive) root could virtually be used in a passive sense, whereas a similar claim cannot be made at all for the anticausative use of middle forms, which rather seems to have been restricted to a very small number of roots.

Although Schmidt evidently does not like the idea that Tocharian middle forms may carry no obvious function at all, in the end even he admits that there are some (according to him rather rare) cases "in denen das Medium als reines Deponens, d.h. in aktiver Geltung, auftritt", adding that "in dem einen oder anderen Falle ist jedoch damit zu rechnen, daß sich die Funktion des Mediums vom heutigen

Standpunkt nicht mehr bzw. noch nicht erkennen läßt" (Schmidt, 1974, 497).

Taking into account the special purposes of this study, in what follows I will keep distinct four different kinds of Tocharian middles: (a) middles that obviously do not convey any detectable semantic function (mostly, but not exclusively forms from media tantum paradigms); (b) middles denoting a special attachment/ involvement of the subject (i.e., reflexive, reciprocal, spontaneous, etc. middles); (c) middles used as passives; (d) middles used as anticausatives.

5.2.1. *Activa tantum and media tantum*

Like any other language that has both middle and active inflection, Tocharian has verbs that are activa tantum or media tantum.[5] Both transitive and intransitive verbs can be activa and media tantum. Schmidt, 1974, 142 claims that very often verbs are media tantum that "seelisch-geistige Zustände und Vorgänge bezeichnen",[6] whereas "Medioactiva[7] und Verben mit durchgehendem Wechsel der Diathese sind dagegen in dieser Gruppe vergleichsweise selten". Note, however, that this can only be called a tendency, since there are also roots from the same semantic field such as, e.g., *kery-/ ᴬkary-* 'laugh' that are activa tantum instead, a fact also pointed out by Schmidt, 1974, 92 himself, but not discussed further. One difference between transitive and intransitive verbs that can be observed is that intransitive verbs in Tocharian are overwhelmingly either activa tantum or media tantum, whereas voice alternation in this group is rarely attested (see the discussion in chap. Valency 4.7.1.). In addition, certain special kinds of stem formations are prone to be media tantum or activa tantum, such as the middle-only present Classes III and IV and the denominatives of Prs/Sub Class XII. As will be argued in the respective chapters, the use of voice in these cases is basically a matter of morphology and not so much of semantics.

---

[5] Due to the scarcity of attested forms, some of these may, of course, in reality have been alternating verbs.

[6] This fits the list of "middle situation types" by Kemmer, 1993, 267ff., where animate verbs, i.e., verbs having a living being as subject prevail.

[7] I.e., verbs with a Prs III or IV.

5.2.2. *Transitive middle vs. intransitive active*

5.2.2.1. *A middle acting as the oppositional transitive of an intransitive (unaccusative) active*

The root *ᴬᴮpyutk-*, which shows a paradigm typical of kausativa, though without having a grundverb beside it, has a remarkable voice alternation: it is the active that has the intransitive valency 'come about, occur' in both languages, while the middle (only attested with certainty in Tocharian A) has the oppositional transitive meaning 'establish, create'. The following active TB forms are clearly intransitive:

107 a 3 *ysaparsa yey āśirvāt weṣṣi teṃ epiṅktene sā͡u oṅko<rño> päs pyautka* "er trat beiseite [und] sprach einen Segensspruch. Inzwischen wurde der Brei fertig" (Schmidt, 2008a, 322);[8] 591 a 5 *(per)ne=<a>rhanteññe kṣayajñāṃmpa ṣe lkāsi ram no kälmaṣṣäṃ-ne pyutkäske(ṃ)-ne krentauwn(a)* "the Arhatship together with the knowledge of the annihilation (of the Kleśas) as it were, enables him [i.e., the Arhat] to see, the virtues come to him" (see the discussion of the passage s.v. *kälm-* '± enable, allow'). The active Pt *pyautkare* in 108 b 1 is without context, while the Prs *pyutkäṣṣäṃ* in the Prātimokṣa passage 329 a 4 is again fragmentary: //// *rkātär pāyti pyutkäṣṣäṃ*. Adams, DoT, 409 takes *pāyti* as object ("[this sin] establishes *pāyti*"), and for this analysis one can adduce the fact that the sanctions in the original Prātimokṣa show the accusative. However, one cannot exclude intransitive "*pāyti* comes about". The newly attested *pyutkäṣṣim* is unclear as well: THT 1335 frg. a a 2 //// *pyutkạṣṣim waste nestsi* //// "I would become (became?) a refuge"? The two TB middle forms are also attested in too fragmentary a context to yield any reliable information.

The infinitive *pyutkässi* in 297, 1 b 1f., on the other hand, rather has a transitive meaning: *āyorṣṣe pāramit pyutkässi aiymasu poyśi saim wasta • ara(ṇ)imi ñimtsa kenantse saswe ṣayt täṅkwaññet wnolmeṃ* "Die Vollkommenheit im Geben zustande zubringen wünschend, warst du, o Allwissender, o Schutz [und] Zuflucht, Herr der Erde mit Namen Araṇemi; du liebtest die Wesen" (Schmidt, 1974, 144).

---

[8] For the correct restoration *oṅko<rño>* see Schmidt, 2008a, 316, fn. 15 and Pinault, 2008, 113.

In Tocharian A, all active forms are clearly intransitive, all middle forms transitive; see the discussion of the passages by Schmidt, 1974, 493ff.

Since a formal kausativum can indeed be intransitive if the respective grundverb is also intransitive (see chap. Valency 4.11.),[9] one may assume that *pyutk-* had indeed, and evidently replaced, an intransitive grundverb '± come into being', which means that it is not the intransitive use of the finite active forms that one ought to feel concern about. Of course, the case of *[AB]pyutk-* is strongly reminiscent of the two *middle* Ipv I forms *karsar* and *prutkar*, which are the only forms among the ones formally belonging to the respective Pt I grundverb paradigms to show the semantics typical of the respective kausativum paradigms. If it is correct that the behavior of these two imperative forms reflects an original indifference of verbal stems in suffixal pre-PT *-ā- → PT *-ā- with respect to valency, the behavior of the kausativum paradigm(s) from *[AB]pyutk-* can be neatly explained by assuming that the former grundverb paradigm(s) eventually ousted by the kausativum paradigm(s) had also been built around a stem in suffixal (pre-PT *-ā- >) PT *-ā-, viz. a PT stem *pyutk-ā-. See furthermore the case of 3.sg.mid. Pt I *lmāte* s.v. *läm[(ā)]-* 'sit'.

5.2.2.2.   *"Objektives Aktiv" beside "subjektives Medium"*

The cases discussed in the following paragraph differ from the one of *[AB]pyutk-* in that the respective transitive middle forms do not function either as oppositional transitives or as causatives of the respective intransitive active forms. We are dealing here with forms from alleged "Verben der sinnlichen Wahrnehmung" with regard to which Schmidt, 1974, 183ff. and 1997c, 542ff. claims that there exists a difference between "subjektiver und objektiver Bedeutung". Again according to Schmidt, there are actually two different groups of such Tocharian verbs to be kept distinct: those showing a "subjektives Aktiv" and an "objektives Medium" (such as *klyauṣäṃ* 'listen' vs. *klyauṣtär* 'is heard'), and those showing an "objektives Aktiv" and a "subjektives Medium" (such as active *[AB]wär[(ā)]-* 'smell (itr.)' vs. middle *[AB]wär[(ā)]-* 'smell (tr.)'). While the difference between "subjektives Aktiv" and "objektives Medium" is apparently the usual voice/valency alternation of an active transitive and middle intransitive or passive,

---

[9] Interestingly enough, while the intransitive grundverb of *śäw-/ [A]śāw-* 'live' is activum tantum, the synonymous intransitive Kaus. III shows both active and middle forms without change of meaning.

the opposite pattern of a transitive middle standing beside an intransitive active is indeed peculiar, as already noted a propos of ^{AB}*pyutk-* as discussed above. Schmidt presents the following examples for that second pattern: "AB *wär-* 'riechen'", "A *pälk-* Akt. 'aussehen', Med. 'sehen'", "*käln-* 'tönen'", and "*ākl-* 'lernen' < 'hinhören, zuhören'". Both *käln-* and *ākl-* Schmidt derives from the PIE root *√k̂leu̯ 'hören', and by his concept of "objektives Aktiv" and "subjektives Medium" he wants to explain why intransitive *käln-* is activum tantum, and why medium tantum *ākl-* has the meaning 'learn'. However, as is shown in chap. Valency 4.7.1., intransitive verbs in Tocharian are in general either activa or media tantum. While the reason lying behind the choice of voice in these two verbs would certainly merit a special study, it has to be pointed out that the etymological connection of *ākl-* 'learn' with *√k̂leu̯ is possible but far from certain, and, what is more, there are other, similarly transitive verbs such as *eṅk-* 'seize' that are also medium tantum.[10]

On the other hand, the verbs ^{AB}*wär^(a)-* 'smell' and ^A*pälk-* 'shine' vs. ^A*pälk^ä-* 'see' are indeed to be taken more seriously.

However, the problem of ^A*pälk-* is more complex than can be guessed from Schmidt's discussion. Schmidt claims that the intransitive activum tantum ^A*pälk-* 'shine, look, appear' (itr) (I/-/I) belongs to the very same paradigm as transitive, medium tantum ^A*pälk^ä-* 'see' (-/V/I) by explicitly stating that both roots are not "zwei selbständige Verben". But since both roots certainly differ with respect to A-character vs. non-A-character, i.e., are synchronically different with respect to stem formation, there can be no doubt that they are different roots from a synchronic point of view. This is even true for the *ā*-preterit attested for both roots, because in Tocharian B *pälk^ä-* 'see' and *pälk-* 'shine' show two different *ā*-preterit formations (*pälk^ä-* 'see' has a Subclass 1 preterit with root-initial palatalization, e.g., 3.sg. *palyka*, whereas *pälk-* 'shine' has no root-initial palatalization, e.g., 3.sg. *pälka*), and it is hence conceivable that Tocharian A once also had such a palatalized (i.e., Subclass 4) Pt I from ^A*pälk^ä-* 'see'. Also for this purely morphological reason one cannot simply speak of valency alternation between ^A*pälk-* 'shine, look' and ^A*pälk^ä-* 'see' by mere voice alternation (such as is indeed attested with ^A*pyutk-*) — at least from a synchronic point of view. While intransitive ^{AB}*pälk-* 'shine' is activum tantum in both languages, the question is rather why ^A*pälk^ä-* 'see' is

---

[10] Schmidt, 1974, 240f. and 394ff. explained the middle voice in *eṅk-* 'seize' as that of a verb "des körperlichen und geistigen [An-sich-]Nehmens".

medium tantum in Tocharian A in contrast to Tocharian B, where the paradigm is almost exclusively attested in the active. The reason should, in my opinion, more likely be sought in the fact that Tocharian B seemed to have had another Sub V stem *pälkā- 'burn' from pälk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'burn' that judging by the Prs III ought to have been a media tantum itself (no subjunctive from the grundverb of pälk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'burn' may be attested, but it can safely be set up based on the pattern of other Prs III verbs), so that by using pälkᵃ- 'see' in the active a case of homonymy could be avoided. Since Tocharian A had completely abandoned the grundverb of ᴬpälk⁽ᵃ⁾ʔ- 'burn', no such homonymy between a middle-only Sub V *pälkā- 'burn' and the middle-only Sub V pälkā- 'see' was about to occur in Tocharian A. To be sure, the fact that ᴬpälkᵃ- 'see' is medium tantum in Tocharian A cannot have anything to do with the semantics of this verb, because in Tocharian A the present stem of 'see' is provided by the root ᴬläk⁽ᵃ⁾-, which has both voices and the active of which is even attested more often than the middle.

The case of ᴬᴮwär⁽ᵃ⁾- is again different. The original meaning of the root, which may have ended in a laryngeal,[11] was no doubt 'smell (itr.)' alone. The meaning 'smell (tr.)' is attested for two forms only, the Inf warstsi, and the 3.pl.mid. Pt I wärskānte. The latter form is extremely remarkable also from a morphological point of view: it is a Pt I in *non-palatalizing -ā-* belonging to an *sk*-Prs/Sub stem *wäräsk-,[12] which in its turn, also quite remarkably, underwent a lautgesetzlich development into *wärsk-, and did not analogically preserve the *-ä- in front of suffixal -sk-. From a morphological point of view, both *wärsk- and wärskā- are best to be taken for preserved archaisms.

Since wärskānte (with no doubt suffixal -ā-) is the only finite form of the verb with transitive meaning, and since in TA/TB pälkā- 'see' suffixal -ā- is involved as well, the obvious choice will be, of course, to compare again the middle Ipv I forms karsar and prutkar, especially with regard to the fact that karsar itself has a meaning typical of the forms of the kausativum paradigm, but actually not really causative

---

[11] Actually, we find -ā- in the Inf wrātsi only, whereas there also exists a Prs/Sub I/II form wartär that lacks the -ā- one should have expected if the -ā- in wrātsi would have been of suffixal origin.

[12] But note that wärsk- in wärskānte itself evidently goes back directly to pre-PT *wärsk- and not to a preform *wäräsk-, which should have resulted in TB *warsk- as attested in warskemane, etc. Accordingly, for the Prs/Sub stem TB warsk- we have to assume a development *wärsk- > *wäräsk- (with analogical *-äsk-) > *wärsk-, i.e., a so-called "Duke of York Gambit".

either, viz. 'make know*n*!'. As discussed in chap. Pt I, I think the verbal stem in suffixal -*ā*- pre-PT *ke/ärsā- originally had simply denoted 'with knowledge', and so the transitive meanings of the middle-inflected stems pre-PT *pälkā- and *wärskā- may be explained in an analogous way, scil. as due to the fact that these two stems originally just had the meaning 'with shine/shining' and 'with smell(ing)', respectively. Needless to say, the fact that in the end only or mostly the middle forms of all these stems in suffixal -*ā*- developed a transitive meaning out of original 'with abstract X' proves that at least in (pre-)PT times the middle could hardly have been associated with the concept of intransitivity at all.

5.2.3. *Interference of anticausative middle and other middle functions*

The middle function conveying a special involvement of the subject without changing the verb's semantic roles, and the anticausative function causing such a change of valency only very rarely come into conflict in Tocharian. The reason for this is that the possibility of expressing valency change by mere voice alternation itself is restricted to very few verbal patterns and roots. As discussed in detail in chap. Valency 4.7.2., here mainly belong what seem to be typically unaccusative verbs of the type *näk-* 'destroy, disappear'. These have a well-defined paradigm consisting of a Sub III, etc. On the other hand, very few verbs show the various middle functions at the same time. A prominent example is *tās-* 'put', which has a transitive active 'put, set, place' and middle forms that can (a) be intransitive ('place oneself'), (b) be passive ('be compared'), or (c) have other semantics typical of middles such as 'set something for oneself' without changing the verb's valency. A quite singular middle behavior is found with the root *luk*^(a)- 'light up; illuminate': it has an intransitive grundverb paradigm with a Prs III stem, and an antigrundverb paradigm with a present of Class VIII. While the middle 2.sg. Prs VIII *lukṣtar* in 214 a 1 has transitive valency (*lukṣtar śaiyṣṣeṃ* "you illuminate the world (on behalf of yourself)", cf. Schmidt, 1974, 468), the 3.pl.mid. Prs VIII *luksentr=eśne* in H 149.add 116 a 2 is intransitive: "the eyes light up" (cf. Hackstein, 1995, 124). In this case it is the anticausative use of the middle in the antigrundverb that is exceptional, because *luk*^(a)- has a whole grundverb paradigm stem formation for expressing intransitive

'light up', and variation in stem formation is the normal means of expressing valency in Tocharian in general.[13]

5.2.4. *Middle variants of active forms without detectable function*

As already indicated above, sometimes the function of middle forms remains unclear, e.g., "bei einer größeren Zahl von Kausativen", as per Schmidt, 1974, 505ff.[14] Schmidt, 1974, 21f. also points out cases such as the frequently attested root *pär-* 'bear, wear, carry, take', which is activum tantum in Tocharian B, but medium tantum in Tocharian A, although no difference in meaning or function between the two languages can be found. Its suppletive root *kām^{ä}-* 'carry, take' is medium tantum in both languages. Similarly, the grundverb of the often-attested root ^{AB}*kälp$^{(ä)}$-* 'obtain' is medium tantum in Tocharian A, but inflects overwhelmingly actively in Tocharian B.

Thomas, 1985a, 99 suggests that whenever a verbal stem has both middle and active voice without semantic difference, "stilistische Gründe (Wunsch nach Variation)" may be a factor behind this. Widmer, 2006, 524f. even goes so far as to state that in Tocharian, like in Sanskrit and Middle Indic, "en poésie, moyen et actif sont utilisés en fonction de leur valeur métrique", giving as one single example active *pälskoy* in B 133 a 1 and middle *palskoyträ* in B 300 a 3 both functioning as equivalents of Skt. *samīkṣeta*, which is built from a verbal stem for which no differences in meaning between active and middle forms can be found at all (as discussed by Schmidt, 1974, 179ff.). Whether such stylistic reasons may indeed also lie behind the choice of middle and active forms is a question that merits a special philological study that is beyond the scope of this work. Of course, Widmer's approach will seem familiar and welcome to any Hellenist, because in Greek poetry such as Homer we are facing quite similar problems, see recently Nussbaum, 2002, esp. 185ff. (with ref.). To be honest, we would get confronted with the problem of no visible

---

[13] Note that other antigrundverb stems show valency alternation by simple voice alternation as well. In these other cases, however, the anticausative middle of the antigrundverb has a meaning different from the intransitive grundverb paradigm, cf. ^{AB}*wāk$^{(ä)}$-* Gv. 'split apart (itr.), bloom', Antigv. act. 'take apart', mid. 'differ', Kaus. II 'let bloom'.

[14] Note that in kausativum paradigms the middle would be expected to be rarely used in anticausative function for a priori considerations, viz. because the intransitive counterpart of such paradigms was already provided by the grundverb.

semantic difference or function on a much larger scale whenever we should try to give a synchronic motivation for the middle-only inflection of, at least, most of the media tantum in purely semantic terms; and by this I do not mean Tocharian media tantum only, but the media tantum of all archaic branches of IE.[15]

---

[15] The argumentation by Schmidt, 1974 on purely semantic grounds as to why certain forms are middle and others are not seems quite forced in a lot of cases. Note that Oettinger, 1993, 356f. fairly honestly admits that in Hittite, many of what he calls "stative" forms actually denote either a "Vorgang ohne zu vermutende Reflexivität" or a "Handlung ohne zu vermutende Reflexivität", and see also Oettinger, 1993, 353: "Sind reflexive Handlungsmedien nicht oppositiv, sondern Media tantum, [...] so ist die Reflexivität nicht wirklich erweisbar, sondern kann lediglich aufgrund typologischen Vergleichs vermutet werden."

THE ROOT PRETERIT — CLASS 0

Tocharian A possesses a small group of verbs showing causative alternation that form perfectly regular[1] active preterits of Class III with transitive valency, but which are remarkable with respect to the oppositional intransitive preterit: as oppositional intransitives to those transitive active forms of Pt III all of these roots use *middle* forms built from those very roots[2] which entirely *lack* the expected (*)-*sā*-, or any kind of suffix (TG, 375, § 454; TEB I, 247, § 442,1). Quite understandably, these formations are usually subsumed under headings such as "*s*-Präteritum" (as in TEB I, 247, § 442,1), but since they precisely lack the (*)-*s(ā)*- otherwise typical of Pt III middles, I rather prefer to set up a special class for this kind of middles, assigning to them the label "Pt 0", and calling them "root preterits", since they are root formations from a synchronic, and most probably also diachronic, point of view. No similar formation is attested in Tocharian B.

The following six TA roots showing causative alternation form such a root preterit:[3]

ᴬtäm- 'be born', *ᴬnäk-* 'be destroyed, disappear', *ᴬpäk-* 'cook, ripen', *ᴬluk-* 'light up', *ᴬwāk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'split apart', *ᴬtsäk-* 'burn'.

Quite remarkably, these roots were joined by the transitive root *ᴬyām-* 'do', for the middle paradigm of which both Pt III and Pt 0 forms are attested:

1.sg.	*yāmwe*	1.pl.	—
2.sg.	*yāmte*	2.pl.	—
3.sg.	*tamät, nakät, pakt-äṃ, lyokät, wākät, tsakät*	3.pl.	*tamänt, lyokänt*
PPt	*tatmu, nanku, pakku, tsatsku*		

---

[1] Apart from the question of root-initial palatalization.

[2] Of course one may have rather expected intransitive Pt I formations to fulfill this function.

[3] In what immediately follows, I indicate the (oppositional) intransitive meanings of those roots only.

In addition, Winter, 1976a, 29 = 2005, 165 proposes the restoration of a 3.sg. TA *yāmä(t)* in A 375 b 5, which is a likely guess, but, nevertheless, not the only possible solution (see the discussion s.v. *^{A}yām-*).

Out of these six unaccusative root preterits, five have a non-debated PIE root etymology, which is a high percentage of connectable verbs for any Tocharian verbal class:

^{A}näk- 'be destroyed, disappear' < PIE *√nek̂, *^{A}päk-* 'cook, ripen' < PIE *√pekʷ, *^{A}luk-* 'light up' < PIE *√leu̯k, *^{A}wāk$^{(ä)}$-* 'split apart' < PIE *√u̯eh₂ĝ/g or *√u̯aĝ/g, *^{A}tsäk-* 'burn' < PIE *√dʰegʷʰ.

Note that most of the root preterit forms have a non-palatalizing PT *æ as root vowel, with the exceptions of TA *yāmwe*, TA *yāmte*, and TA *wākät*, and also with the exception of TA *lyok-* in TA *lyokät*, TA *lyokänt*, which seems to attest to PT *'æ.

In Tocharian B, most of the respective oppositional intransitive formations are middle forms as well,[4] which follow the pattern of Pt III inflection, and therefore show (*)-*sā*- before the endings.[5] As for the root vocalism, Tocharian B, as a rule, has non-palatalizing PT *æ whenever Tocharian A attests to non-palatalizing PT *æ: accordingly, *temtsate* responds to TA *tamät*, *neksate* to TA *nakät*, and *tseksamai* to TA *tsakät*. As for palatalized TA *lyok-*, Tocharian B responds with non-palatalized *lauksāte* (MQ, archaic ductus) on the one hand, and palatalized *lyuk-* (!) in *lyuksamnte* on the other hand. In Pt III middles of Tocharian B that do not function as oppositional intransitives a non-palatalizing PT *æ is never found as root vowel. Accordingly, there can be no doubt that those TB middles of Pt III are to be explained as secondarily sigmatized former root preterit middles, as per Ringe, 1990, 214; Jasanoff, 2003, 180; Villanueva Svensson, 2006, 310.[6] As a corollary, the other sigmatic middle preterits of Tocharian

---

[4] Only *wāk^ä-* behaves differently; there is no trace of any middle (Class III) preterit, only the PPt *wawākau*, which points to the existence of an intransitive Pt I in TB.

[5] In TA, there is no clear case of a Pt III middle functioning as oppositional intransitive.

[6] Villanueva Svensson also claims that in addition TB "*nemtsamai* „bowed" ... and 3 pl. *kessante* „was [sic!] extinguished‟" belong here; and whereas the first of these two forms simply does not exist (because the form has to be read otherwise, as per Couvreur, 1954, 89), the latter one attested in 421 frg. 1 b may indeed have the semantics of an oppositional intransitive; see the translation of the passage by Couvreur, 1954c, 116.

B, i.e., those not involved in causative alternation, will have had (*)-*sā*-
in use at an earlier stage than the middle preterits of the type *temtsate*
functioning as oppositional intransitives. However, as the evidence of
transitive *ᴬyām*- 'do' suggests,[7] even the transitive middles among the
Pt III middles may not have been sigmatic right from the start, i.e.,
since PIE times, as per Jasanoff, 2003, 180, 196, but may have been
sigmatized merely as a result of an inner-Tocharian development.

The middle root preterits are usually derived from PIE middle root
aorists,[8] and it would only be consistent with what has been argued
above to derive the respective Pt III middles of Tocharian B from the
same source. Nevertheless, the authors of TEB I, 247, § 442,1 claim that
whereas the TA root preterits of the *tamät* type go back to the "idg.
athematische Wurzelaorist", the TB Class III preterits of the *temtsate*
type are to be derived from forms with an "ursprünglichen
Perfektreduplikation", but it is not so clear to me if according to TEB,
temtsate, etc. should really be derived from old middle perfect forms.[9]

   If we are indeed dealing here with former intransitive middle root
aorists, the fact that these asigmatic middles stand beside transitive
actives with an -*s*- showing up at least in the 3.sg. is, of course,
strongly reminiscent of Ancient Greek pairs such as intransitive
middle root aorist ἔφθιτο / transitive active sigmatic aorist ἔφθεισα,
see Ringe, 1990, 215f. However, by claiming that "no mediopassive s-
aorists are reconstructable for PIE", Ringe, nevertheless, does not want
to assume "a shared innovation in the real historical sense, but a
parallel development". On the other hand, Villanueva Svensson, 2006,
310f. is quite committal in stating that "the opposition of an active,

---

[7] If the Pt 0 of *ᴬyām*- is not secondary, but I cannot see on which model.

[8] With the notable exception of Watkins, 1962, 72ff., who proposed that "in
the few forms of the type *pakät nakät tsakät* we see the reflexes of -*to*-
participles *pekʷ-to*- 'ripe' *nek-to*- 'perished' *dhegʷh-to*- 'burned'", but such
an analysis does not offer a clue to the main problem posed by these forms,
i.e., the root vowel PT *æ. As far as I can see, no one has so far suggested these
forms go back to PIE middle perfects, although the use of pre-PT *-mai̯ and
*-tai̯ as middle endings of the 1.sg. and 2.sg. in the preterit suggests that pre-
PT had indeed inherited a middle perfect from PIE, and that this middle
perfect had turned into a preterit quite soon; but, of course, also a middle
perfect should not have had as a root vowel the PIE *o that seems to underlie
the non-palatalizing PT *æ.

[9] Note that Winter, 1993, 200f. = 2005, 444f. has clearly shown that the
initial accent of forms like TB *temtsate* is not to be explained by the former
presence of a reduplication syllable.

transitive sigmatic aorist and an intransitive (middle) root aorist recurs in Greek and probably inherits an Indo-European pattern of conjugation", without offering any further discussion or reference such as Jasanoff, 2003, 194, where the claim is made that "the association of the *s*-aorist with transitivity in the later IE languages ... ultimately reflects the use of *-*s*- as an ancillary transitivity marker in bivalent roots". A completely different account can be found in Peters, 1994, A-131, fn. 2.

As already stated above, the root vowel found in the TA root preterits is usually non-palatalizing PT *æ, which in word-internal position is usually to be derived from a pre-PT *o-vowel. According to the teaching of traditional IE linguistics, however, there were no PIE middle root aorists with an *o as root vowel. For this reason, Peters, 2004, 440f. tried to trace back the PT *æ of TA *nakät*, etc. to an earlier PT *ä-vowel by assuming that also in these middle aorists a PT "Lautwandel von vortonigem *-*ä*- zu *-*æ*- in maximaler Akzentferne" had occurred. However, this strategy was completely abandoned in Peters, forthc., mainly for the reason that no such sound change is met in the Pt I middles, the early PT ancestor forms which should be expected to have had the same kind of accentuation as the early PT ancestor forms of the TA root preterit forms.

As a matter of fact, there are now some scholars who do indeed believe in the existence of PIE *o*-grade middle root aorists, see especially Jasanoff, 1988, 65; 1998, 310; 2003, 180, 194f., 198ff., and most recently 2008, 157, where TA *ñakäs/ nakät* is derived from a "presigmatic aorist" with a "pre-Toch." paradigm active 1.sg. $*nék̂-h_2e$, 2.sg. $*nék̂-th_2e$, 3.sg. *nék̂-s-t, 3.pl. *nék̂-r̥s, middle 3.sg. *nók̂-o (> *nók̂-to), 3.pl. *nók̂-ro (> *nók̂-n̥to). This theory most elegantly accounts for both TA *nakät* with *n*- standing beside TA *ñakäs* with *ñ*-, and TB *lauksāte* (MQ) with *l*- standing beside TA *lyokäs*, TB *lyauksa* with *ly*-, but has to dismiss TB *lyuksamnte* as being secondary, which is in accordance with the fact that *lyuksamnte* is indeed a late form (as is shown by Peyrot, 2008, 156) — in contrast to *lauksāte*, which is not only an MQ form, but also attested in a manuscript with archaic ductus. Jasanoff was followed by his student Villanueva Svensson, 2006, 310f. In addition, a solution somehow similar to the one proposed by Jasanoff has been adduced by Adams, 1994, 22f., who wanted to derive the TA root preterit from the same category as the Vedic passive aorist, and hence also explained the PT *æ as deriving from inherited PIE *o. The problem with these approaches is, of course, that obvious other comparanda from other branches are

absent, the Indo-Iranian passive aorist indeed showing *o*-grade of the root, but an ending *-i, rather than *-(t)e/o.

If one does not want to operate with *o*-grade middle root aorists inherited from PIE, one will be forced to assume that PT *æ showed up in the Pt 0 forms because of some analogical transfer (the respective active paradigms being mostly the only thinkable source of that *æ). Such a transfer is easy to claim, but is actually difficult to prove, especially for those who would like to side with Ringe, 1990, who denied any pre-PT *o*-grade input for Class III preterits, and assumed that the initial palatal *ñ-* of TA *ñakäs* is more original than the non-palatalized *n-* of TB *neksa*. For this reason, Ringe, 1990, 215 has to claim that "[a]fter palatalization had become phonemic in PT, there is no reason why the root-vowel *e of the active (which reflects PIE *ē) could not have spread to the mediopassive without bringing its initial palatalization with it".

On the other hand, approaches like that of Krause/Thomas, who assume that the Class III preterit is the result of a merger of PIE active perfects (with PIE *o*-grade in the active singular paradigm) and sigmatic aorists (with PIE *ē*-grade in the active paradigm), can quite easily explain all the TA root preterit forms with non-palatalizing root vowel PT *æ by assuming that the respective active forms of Pt III had originally lacked palatalization as well, precisely because they derive from PIE active perfects with a root vowel *o, and that non-palatalizing PT *æ had spread from the active Pt III forms to the respective middle root preterit forms some time before pre-Tocharian A finally (almost) generalized PT *'æ as a root vowel in the active forms of Pt III.

As much as such a strategy would work for TA *nakät* vs. TA *ñakäs*, the initial palatal *ñ-* of which may perfectly well be less original than the initial non-palatal of the TB equivalent *neksa*, it would hardly make sense to claim that TB *lauksāte* owes its *lauk-* to a former PT active 3.sg. *læwksā with non-palatalizing *æ, because in the case of the root PIE *√leu̯k, both languages have an active 3.sg. form with palatal root initial, thereby clearly attesting to a PT *l'æwksā with *l'- deriving from a pre-PT *lēu̯k- showing lengthened grade otherwise typical of Narten formations. Now, Narten formations also typically have an *e*-grade in the middle forms; consequently, TB *lyuk-* in *lyuksante* as if from pre-PT *leu̯k- looks exactly like the respective root allomorph to be expected in the middle, and the earlier attested TB *lauksāte* looks even more unexpected. However, *lauk-* may also be explained by another kind of analogy: since TB *lalaukarne* clearly

attests to the former existence of a further preterit made from that very root, viz. a Pt I showing persistent *lauk-* (probably of denominative origin), *lauksāte* then may simply be taken for a blend of *lyuks-* with that **laukā-*.

But even with *lauksāte* now explained away, it would still remain unclear why in the context of preterit Class III the regular root vowel of the (singular) active, viz. *(')æ, was analogically transferred only to a handful of formally quite archaic, i.e., asigmatic, middle forms functioning as oppositional intransitives, and not to all middle forms, i.e., especially the sigmatic ones with the same transitive valency that is found with the respective active forms. With respect to this problem, Winter, 1994a, 291ff. = 2005, 472ff. pointed out that in the context of Pt III, unexpected PT *æ instead of an expected zero grade is also met in a couple of PPt forms such as TB *neneku* and *tetemu*, and on account of this evidence set up a special kind of scenario, which I think could still be somehow further improved and updated. An optimized version of Winter's explanation then would run as follows:

To Class III preterits contributed both[10] PIE perfects with a pre-PT ablaut *o/zero in the active paradigm, and preterits showing persistent pre-PT *ē as root vowel in the active forms of the indicative paradigm. On the model of the formations with persistent *ē in the active indicative, the Class III preterits from original perfects subsequently started to generalize *o in the active indicative paradigm, most notably, of course, in the respective forms of the 3.pl. As soon as a variation pre-PT zero/*o had begun to show up in 3.pl. forms of active paradigms of Class III preterits as a consequence of that leveling process, on the analogy of this variation the same kind of zero/*o variation could have been initiated in all kinds of original zero-grade forms that synchronically somehow belonged to, and were associated with, active paradigms of Pt Class III, and especially 3.pl. active forms of that class having *o (at least as a synchronic variant of zero), and not *ē, as a root vowel (i.e., in both middle and PPt forms of such a kind), with the *o variants, as a rule, in the end ousting the original zero grades.

Such a scenario would correctly predict the existence of middle and PPt forms with PT *'ä and not PT *æ as root vowel such as TB

---

[10] Of course the use of the word "both" is not meant to imply that there has not been, or could not have been, any other input to Pt Class III, such as non-Narten root aorists or non-Narten imperfects.

lyuksamnte, *lyelyūku* and *palyksatai*, *pepalykusa* simply on the evidence of the palatalized active indicative forms TB *lyauksa* and *pelykwa* attesting to ancestor forms with pre-PT *ē rather than pre-PT *o as root vowel. But then on the other hand, why do we still find middle and PPt forms (more or less) clearly related to Pt Class III that do have non-palatalizing PT *ä rather than PT *æ as root vowel at all?

As for the PPts among these forms, many of them are built from roots ending in -*tk*-. Since these are inner-Tocharian creations (see chap. *tk*-Roots), the relevant roots could not have formed a fully inflected perfect paradigm with a 3.pl. active form in early times at all; as for TB *kekamu*, *kekmu* from the root *käm*- 'come', in pre-PT times there probably existed only a non-Narten root aorist and no kind of perfect made from this root. Generally speaking, PPts, because of being non-finite forms, may have tended to be quite conservative, and therefore it does not come as a huge surprise that from the root *näk*- 'destroy', 'be destroyed, disappear', which no doubt could and should be expected to have formed a fully inflected perfect in pre-PT times, we find both *neneku* and *nenku*.

As for the middle forms, one could venture the guess that pre-PT *o was only introduced as root vowel into the pre-PT ancestor forms of the root preterit forms of Tocharian A and their TB equivalents in (*)-*sā*-, and not into proto-forms of any other middle forms of Pt III, precisely because at the time that analogical leveling took place the ancestor forms of TA *nakät*, TB *neksate*, etc. still formed parts of perfect paradigms as much as the proto-forms of the PPt forms showing a root vowel *æ, and accordingly had started out as *middle perfect* forms rather than as *middle root aorist* forms.

THE *ā*-PRETERIT — CLASS I

7.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRETERIT CLASS I

7.1.1. *General remarks*

The verbal stems that belong to preterit Class I all have stem-final PT *-ā- in all forms of their indicative paradigms, which is also true for the members of preterit Classes II, IV, V, and VII. At the same time the stems of Pt I lack the specific characteristics (such as constant initial accent, reduplication, etc.) of these other preterits in PT *-ā-. This definition indeed holds for all the forms that are usually subsumed under the term "Class I Pt"; nevertheless, the forms traditionally assigned to Pt I actually belong to two completely different types of preterit formation.

On the one hand, there is a vast number of Pt I stems in which the stem-final -*ā(-)* follows the non-palatalized variant of a non-syllabic.[1] The Tocharian roots having such a kind of Pt I regularly also have A-character, i.e., they have a subjunctive stem of Class V or Class VI ending in PT *-ā-.[2] Diachronically, many (although by no means all) of them derive from PIE bare roots.

On the other hand, there are 16 Pt I stems in which the stem-final -*ā(-)* follows the palatalized variant of a consonant, to which (*)*cäm(p)yā*- 'be able to' and *soyā*- 'become sated' are to be added.

---

[1] Note that this definition is ambiguous with respect to -*y*-, which is just a palatal non-syllabic; as a matter of fact, one stem ending descriptively in -*yā*- (*käryā*-) belongs to a root with A-character (*käry^ä*- 'buy, trade'), while two other stems ((*)*cäm(p)yā*- 'be able to', *soyā*- 'become sated') do not.

[2] Given the limited character of the material available, the real existence of such a subjunctive cannot be guaranteed in every case, but the creation of such forms seems to have been possible at a rather early stage of development with any of these roots, basically because of the *tēzzi* principle (for which see chap. 16.2.3.). Note further that there are very few examples that do not have a Sub V or VI or a Sub II, but a Sub I. These will be treated below on the type *klyauṣa.*

None of these roots has A-character,[3] and most of them clearly derive from PIE suffixed present stems and not PIE bare roots.

7.1.2. *Class I preterits from roots with A-character*

This kind of *ā*-preterit is actually the most productive preterit Class in Tocharian. It is formed with certainty from the following 233 verbs (182 TB, 147 TA, 96 TB = TA; only PPt attested: 38 TB, 51 TA, 8 TB = TA).

āksᵃ- 'waken', *āmpᵃ*- 'rot' (only PPt), *ār⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬār⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'cease', *ārt(t)⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬārtᵃ*- 'love, praise', *ᴬālpᵃ*- 'stroke', *ās⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'dry', *aiw⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be turned towards', *kākᵃ*-/ *ᴬkākᵃ*- 'call', *ᴬkātkᵃ*- 'arise', *kāntsᵃ*- 'sharpen', *kāmᵃ*-/ *ᴬkāmᵃ*- 'carry, take', *kālākᵃ*- 'follow', *kāyᵃ*- 'open (the mouth)' (only PPt), *kārᵃ*- 'gather', *kārp⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬkārp⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'descend', *kāwᵃ*-/ *ᴬkāpᵃ*- 'desire', *kätᵃ*-/ *ᴬkätᵃ*- 'strew', *kätk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬkätk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'cross, pass', *kärk?*- 'bind' (only PPt), *kärkᵃ*- 'rob', *käryᵃ*- 'buy, trade', *kärrᵃ*- 'scold', *kärs⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬkärs⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'know', *kärstᵃ*-/ *ᴬkärṣtᵃ*- 'cut off', *kälᵃ*-/ *ᴬkälᵃ*- 'lead, bring', *ᴬkälkᵃ*- 'go', *kälp⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬkälp⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'obtain', *käl(t)sᵃ*-/ *ᴬkäl(t)sᵃ*- 'pour, (op)press' (TA only PPt), *käsk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'scatter', *kutkᵃ?*-/ *ᴬkutkᵃ?*- 'embody', *kulᵃ*- 'recede', *ᴬkur⁽ᵃ⁾?*- 'age' (only PPt), *ᴬkoṣtᵃ*- 'hit', *kautᵃ*-/ *ᴬkotᵃ*- 'split', *krās⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'vex, be angry', *krämp⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬkrämpᵃ*- 'be hindered' (TA only PPt), *kraup⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬkrop⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'gather', *klāṅkᵃ*- 'go by wagon', *klāpᵃ*- '± touch', *klāyᵃ*-/ *ᴬklāwᵃ*- 'fall', *klāw⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬklāwᵃ*- 'be called', *ᴬklāṅk⁽ᵃ⁾?*- '± be in doubt' (only PPt), *klänts⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬklisᵃ*- 'sleep', *klutkᵃ*- 'turn, become' (only PPt), *klaiksᵃ*-/ *ᴬklepsᵃ*- 'dry up' (only PPt), *klautk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬlotkᵃ*- 'turn, become', *ᴬksā*- '± shine' (only PPt), *tākᵃ*-/ *ᴬtāk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be, become', *ᴬtāpᵃ*- 'eat', *täksᵃ*- '± destroy', *tättᵃ*- 'put' (only PPt), *tänᵃ*- 'attack' (only PPt), *ᴬtäpᵃ*- '?' (only PPt), *tārᵃ?*- '± stretch', *tärkᵃ*-/ *ᴬtärkᵃ*- 'dismiss, emit', *tuk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'hide oneself' (only PPt), *ᴬtkälᵃ?*- 'illuminate', *trāppᵃ*- 'trip' (only PPt), *ᴬtrāskᵃ*- 'chew' (only PPt), *trik⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬtrik⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'go astray', *triw⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬtriw⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be mixed' (TA only PPt), *ᴬtruskᵃ?*- 'yoke' (only PPt), *ᴬtwᵃ*-/*ᴬtwāsᵃ*- 'shine' (only PPt), *twāṅkᵃ*-/ *ᴬtwāṅkᵃ*- '± wear' (A only PPt), *nān⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'appear', *ᴬnāskᵃ*- 'spin', *nätkᵃ*- 'hold off', *ᴬnäm⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'bow' (only PPt), *ᴬnäskᵃ?*- '?' (only PPt), *nittᵃ*- 'collapse', *nuᵃ*- 'cry', *nukᵃ*- 'swallow' (only PPt), *naut⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬnut⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'disappear' (TA only PPt), *ᴬnwᵃ*- '± bear, suffer', *ᴬpātᵃ*- 'plough', *pātkᵃ*- 'give up' (only PPt), *pāssᵃ*- 'rip off', *päkᵃ*-/ *ᴬpäkᵃ*- 'intend', *pännᵃ*-/ *ᴬpänwᵃ*- 'stretch', *pärkᵃ*-/ *ᴬpärkᵃ*- '(a)rise', *pärsᵃ*-/ *ᴬpärs⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'sprinkle', *pärsk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬpärsk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be afraid', *pälᵃ*-/ *ᴬpälᵃ*- 'praise', *pälkᵃ*-/ *ᴬpälkᵃ*- 'see, look at', *ᴬpältᵃ?*- '± drop', *pälskᵃ*-/ *ᴬpäl(t)skᵃ*- 'consider', *pälwᵃ*- 'lament (tr/itr)', *prᵃ*- '± trumpet', *pikᵃ*-/ *ᴬpikᵃ*- 'paint, write', *ᴬpiwᵃ*- 'blow' (only PPt), *putk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬputkᵃ*- 'divide', *ᴬpewᵃ?*- 'card', *pautᵃ*- 'honor' (only PPt), *pruk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'jump', *prutk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *ᴬprutk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be

---

[3] Evidently at the time these preterits were created, the *tēzzi* principle did no longer operate in Tocharian.

shut', *plānt⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*plānt⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'rejoice' (TA only PPt), ᴬ*plā*- '?' (only PPt), *pläṅk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be for sale', ᴬ*pläṅkᵃ*- '± pinch' (only PPt), *mān(t)s⁽ᵃ⁾*-'be sorrowful', ᴬ*mālkᵃ*- 'milk', ᴬ*māṅk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be difficult', *mäk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'run', *mäṅk*- 'lack', *mänt⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*mäntᵃ*- 'stir; destroy; be angry', *märtkᵃ*-/ ᴬ*märtkᵃ*- 'shave', *märs⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*märsᵃ*- 'forget', *mälᵃˀ*- 'melt' (only PPt), (*mäl⁽ᵃ⁾*- ?)/ ᴬ*mäl⁽ᵃ⁾*- '(op)press' (only PPt), *mälk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*mälkᵃ*- '± put (on, together)', *mä(s)ˀ*- 'go' (Pt I + III), *mäskᵃ*- 'be', *mätstsᵃ*- 'starve' (only PPt), *mikᵃˀ*- 'shut (eyes)' (only PPt), *miw⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'tremble', *mutkᵃˀ*- 'pour (out)', *mus⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*musᵃ*- 'rise' (TB only PPt), *musk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*muskᵃ*- 'disappear', *mauk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*mukᵃˀ*- 'desist', *mrausk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*mrosk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'feel disgust', ᴬ*mluskᵃ*- 'escape' (only PPt), ᴬ*yᵃ*- 'go', *yāṅk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be deluded', *yāt⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*yāt⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be (cap)able' (TA only PPt), *yās⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be excited', *yäkᵃ*-/ ᴬ*yäkᵃ*- 'be careless' (only PPt), *yäks⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*yäksᵃ*- 'entangle' (TB only PPt), *yät⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be decorated', ᴬ*yär⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'bathe; purge' (only PPt), *yärttᵃˀ*- 'drag', *yästˀ*- 'hurl down', *yu⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'ripen' (only PPt), ᴬ*yu⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'turn' (only PPt), *yuk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*yukᵃ*- 'overcome' (TA only PPt), ᴬ*yutkᵃ*- 'be worried' (only PPt), *yaukkᵃ*- 'use', *rām⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'compare', *räk*- 'extend oneself (over)' (only PPt), *räṅk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'ascend', ᴬ*räpᵃ*- 'dig', *rämᵃ*-/ ᴬ*rämᵃ*- 'bend' (TA only PPt), *räsᵃˀ*-/ ᴬ*räsᵃ*- 'stretch (out)' (only PPt), *räss⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*räswᵃ*- 'tear', *ritᵃ*- 'seek', *ritt⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*ritᵃ*- 'be attached', *rukᵃˀ*-/ ᴬ*rukᵃˀ*- 'emaciate' (only PPt), ᴬ*rutᵃˀ*- '?' (only PPt), *rutkᵃ*-/ ᴬ*rutkᵃ*- '(re)move', *r(·)wᵃˀ*- '± despair', *lātkᵃ*-/ ᴬ*lātkᵃ*- 'cut off' (TA only PPt), *läk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'see', *läm⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*läm⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'sit', *lik⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*likᵃ*- 'wash' (TA only PPt), *litᵃ*-/ ᴬ*lit⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'fall', ᴬ*litk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'remove', *lipᵃ*-/ ᴬ*lip⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'remain', *luˀ*- 'rub', *luᵃ*-/ ᴬ*luᵃ*- 'send', *luk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'light', *lup⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*lupᵃ*- 'rub, besmirch' (TA only PPt), *wāk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*wāk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'split' (TB only PPt), *wāpᵃ*-/ ᴬ*wāpᵃ*- 'weave', ᴬ*wāmpᵃˀ*- 'decorate', *wāyᵃ*-/ ᴬ*wā*- 'lead', ᴬ*wārᵃˀ*- 'wake up' (only PPt), *wārkᵃ*- 'shear', *wārpᵃˀ*- 'surround' (only PPt), *wārwᵃˀ*-/ ᴬ*wārpᵃˀ*- 'prod', *wālᵃ*-/ ᴬ*wālᵃ*- 'cover', *wāltsᵃ*- 'crush, grind', *wāsk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*wāsk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'stir', *wäks⁽ᵃ⁾*- '± turn away' (only PPt), *wätᵃˀ*- 'fight', ᴬ*wät⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'put' (only PPt), *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*wätk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'separate, decide', *wäntᵃ*-/ ᴬ*wäntᵃ*- 'cover' (only PPt), *wär⁽ᵃ⁾(sk)*- 'smell', *wärpᵃ*-/ ᴬ*wärpᵃ*- 'enjoy, feel', *wärsᵃˀ*- '± pity', *wälᵃˀ*-/ ᴬ*wälᵃˀ*- ' ± shatter' (only PPt), ᴬ*wälkᵃˀ*- '?' (only PPt), *wä(s)ˀ*-/ ᴬ*wä(s)ˀ*- 'give' (Pt I + III), ᴬ*wi⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be frightened' (only PPt), *wik⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*wik⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'disappear', ᴬ*wip⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'moisten' (only PPt), ᴬ*wekᵃ*- 'fall apart', ᴬ*wniskᵃ*- '± crush' (only PPt), *wlāwᵃ*- 'control', *śāw*-/ ᴬ*śāw*- 'live' (TA only PPt), *śuwᵃ*- 'eat, consume', ᴬ*śtārᵃˀ*- 'become tired', *sāk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*sāk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'remain' (TB only PPt), ᴬ*sāmᵃˀ*- 'gather', *sāmp⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'take away', ᴬ*säk*- '± follow', ᴬ*sätᵃˀ*- '?', *sätk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*sätk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'spread out', *särk*- '± take care of' (only PPt), *säl⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*säl⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'fly, arise' (TA only PPt), *säl⁽ᵃ⁾*- Antigv. 'throw', *sälkᵃ*- 'pull; show', *sälpᵃˀ*-/ ᴬ*sälpᵃ*- 'glow' (TA only PPt), ᴬ*sik⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be overflown' (only PPt), ᴬ*sipᵃ*- 'anoint' (only PPt), *siyᵃ*- 'sweat' (only PPt), ᴬ*sukᵃ*- '± bring' (only PPt), *suwᵃ*-/ *swās⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*suw⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ᴬ*swās⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'rain', ᴬ*skāyᵃ*- 'strive', *skärᵃ*- 'scold', *stäm⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*stäm⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'stand', *stäm⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'put', *staukkᵃ*- 'swell' (only PPt), *spārtt⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*spārtw⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'turn; behave; be', *spālkᵃˀ*- '± strive for', *spāw⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'subside', *spänt⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*späntᵃ*- 'trust' (TB only PPt), *spärk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*spärk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'disappear', *srukᵃ*- 'die', *släppᵃˀ*- '± fall into' (only PPt), *tsākᵃ*- 'pierce', *tsāpᵃ*- 'mash, squeeze' (only PPt), ᴬ*tsārtᵃˀ*- 'weep', *tsārw⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*tsārw⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be comforted' (TB only PPt), *tsāltᵃ*- 'chew' (only

PPt), *ᴬtsäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pull out', *tsäṅkᵃ-* '(a)rise', *ᴬtsänᵃ-* 'flow' (only PPt), *tsäm⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬtsäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'grow' (TA only PPt), *tsär⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬtsär⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be separated', *tsälp⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬtsälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pass away', *tsikᵃ-/ ᴬtsikᵃˀ-* 'form' (TA only PPt), *tsitᵃˀ-/ ᴬtsit⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'touch', *tsuw⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬtsuw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'attach oneself', *tsuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'suck (out)'/ *ᴬtsukᵃ-* 'drink'.

Uncertain cases are: *täl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'carry' (*tlava* philologically uncertain), *tinᵃ-* 'defile oneself' (only PPt, Pt I/III), *ᴬwekˀ-* 'tell lies' (only PPt, Pt I/III), *särpˀ-* 'beat' (Pt I/III).

	TB	TA
1.sg.act.	*kälpāwa*	*klisā*
2.sg.act.	*kälpāsta*	*klisāṣt*
3.sg.act.	*kalpa*	*tsälp,*
		kälkā-ṃ
1.pl.act.	*kälpām*	*tsaramäs*
2.pl.act.	*takās;*	*tsalpas*
	cf. *klyauṣāso*	
3.pl.act.	*kälpāre*	*tsalpar*
1.sg.mid.	*klāmai*	*kälpe*
2.sg.mid.	*klātai*	*kälpāte*
3.sg.mid.	*klāte*	*kälpāt*
1.pl.mid.	*klāmnte*[4]	*kälpāmät*
2.pl.mid.	*putkat* (sic)	*kälpāc*
3.pl.mid.	*klānte*	*kälpānt*
3.du.	*stāmais*	*tāken(e)s*

7.1.3. *Subclasses 1-7*

In what follows, I will not use the classification system proposed by Krause (WTG, 158ff., §§ 160ff.), because it mixes together the *ā*-preterits from roots with A-character and the ones from roots with non-A-character and at the same time does not refer to, and does not help to distinguish, the various different ablaut systems. Therefore, I want to propose a new kind of classification for the *ā*-preterits from roots with A-character only. This new system is based on the various kinds of ablaut attested for the root vowels in the indicative paradigms.

Intra-paradigmatic ablaut is in general only found with roots with a non-full root vowel, i.e., *-ä-*, *-i-*, or *-u-* in both languages (although roots with a pre-PT root vowel *ǎ could, and indeed sometimes did, have an ablaut variation PT *å̆/ā). However, not every *ā*-preterit

---

[4] For *-mnte* instead of *-mtte* see Peyrot, 2008, 156.

formed from such a root does show ablaut. Such ablauting *ā*-preterits with surface *-ä-*, *-i-*, or *-u-* were classified as Class Ib *ā*-preterits by TG, 367ff., § 452, and as Class Ia *ā*-preterits by WTG, 158ff., §§ 160ff. On the other hand, there exist a lot of *ā*-preterits which constantly have the full vowel (*)-*ā*- (or *-ai-/* TA *-e-*, *-au-/* TA *-o-*) as their root vowel, which then also shows up constantly in the respective subjunctive and imperative stems (= Class Ia, according to TG, 363ff., § 450), i.e., the same lack of ablaut is then also met in both the corresponding *ā*-subjunctive (cf. TG, 365f.), and in the corresponding *ā*-imperative.

With respect to synchrony, seven subclasses can, in my opinion, be set up, viz. by taking into account, and taking advantage of, the various different ablaut structures. With respect to ablaut the middle stem, the singular active stem, and sometimes also the plural active stem may behave differently from each other.

	Sg. active	Pl. active	Sg./pl. middle
1		*ä* +Pal	*ä* -Pal
2		*ä* -Pal	
3	*ä* -Pal	*æ* -Pal	*ä* -Pal
4	*ä* +Pal	*æ* -Pal	*ä* -Pal
5		*ā* -Pal	
6		*ä* +Pal	
7		*ā* +Pal	

7.1.3.1. *Subclass 1*

Subclass 1 of the non-full vowel *ā*-preterit is characterized by a persistent *ä*-vowel that palatalizes in the whole active stem but not in the middle. We obviously have to do with a pre-PT *e/ä ablaut pattern, with *ä going back to a PIE zero grade. The Subclass 1 pattern is only attested in Tocharian B; however, there is reason to believe that the class came into being by a simplification of the ablaut structure of Subclass 4, for which see below. The following forms belong here:

kätᵃ- 'strew' (tr) (x/x/x) (VI/V/I) Pt I 2.sg. *śtasta* (MQ), 1.pl. *śitām*, 3.pl. *śtare* (MQ), 3.sg.mid. *ktāte*, 3.pl.mid. *ktānte*; *kärs⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'know' (tr) (x/x/x) (VI/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *śärsāwa*, 2.sg. *śärsāsta*, 3.sg. *śarsa*, 3.pl. *śärsāre*, 3.sg.mid. *kärsāte-ne*; *kälᵃ*- 'lead, bring' (tr) (x/x/x) (Xa/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *śala*, 3.pl. *śilāre-ne*, 1.sg.mid. *klāmai*, 2.sg.mid. *klātai*, 3.sg.mid. *klāte*, 1.pl.mid. *klāmnte* (S), 3.pl.mid. *klānte*; *tärkᵃ*- 'dismiss, emit' (tr) (x/a/x) (VI/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *cärkāwa*, 2.sg. *cärkāsta*, 3.sg.

carka, 3.pl. *cärkāre*, 3.sg.mid. *tärkāte*, 3.pl.mid. *tärkānte*; *läm*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sit' (itr) (a/a/x) (V/V/I)[5] Pt I 2.sg. *lyamāstä* (MQ), 3.sg. *lyama*, 3.pl. *lymāre*, 3.sg.mid. *lmāte.*

In addition, here also belong:

*pärs*ᵃ- act. 'sprinkle', mid. 'spray' (tr/itr) (a/x/x) (VI-VII/V/I) Pt I 3.pl. *pirsāre* (Š), 3.sg.mid. *pärsāte* (Š);[6] *pälk*ᵃ- 'see, look at' (tr) (-/a/x) (-/V/I) Pt I 2.sg. *pälykāsta*, 3.sg. *palyka*, 3.pl. *pälykāre/pilykār* (S), 3.sg.mid. *pälkāte.*

It is quite evident that both the ablaut *i/ä* and the variation *-lyk-/-lk-* reflect a former contrast *p'ä- in the whole active vs. *pä- in the whole middle (see also the discussion on palatalization in chap. Sound Laws 1.7., from which it may become clear that *pärk*ᵃ- '(a)rise' could belong here as well; cf. also Peyrot, 2008, 56f.). It is difficult to judge whether *pänn*ᵃ- 'stretch, pull (out, up)' (tr) (x/a/x) (II/V/I) with Pt I 3.sg.act. *piñña* (S), 3.sg.mid. *pännāte* (S) is another case in point. The alternation of *i* in the singular active and *ä* in the middle may point to the very same pattern; however, the *i* could also be due to the following *-ññ-* (cf. Peyrot, 2008, 56), and the root shows an unexpected stem-final alternation between palatal *-ññ-* and non-palatalized *-nn-* also in other stems (see the discussion in chap. Sound Laws 1.7. and s.v. *pänn*ᵃ- 'stretch').

For the following stems palatalized actives, but no middles are attested, so Subclass 6 is also possible:
kätk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'cross, pass' (tr/itr) (x/x/a) (VI-VII-IXa/V/I) with Pt I (tr) 1.sg. *śätkāwa*, 2.sg. *śätkāsta*, 3.sg. *śatka*, 3.pl. *śitkāre*; *kutk*ᵃ⁷- 'embody, incarnate' (tr) (-/-/a) (VII/-/I) with Pt I 1.pl. *śutkām*; *klänts*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sleep' (itr) (a/a/a) (XII/V/I) with Pt I 3.sg. *klyantsa*; *tär*ᵃ⁷- '± stretch' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I) with Pt I 3.pl. *cirār* (sic); *lu*ᵃ- 'send' (tr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I) with Pt I 1.sg. *lywāwa*, 2.sg. *lywāsta*, 3.sg. *lyuwa*; *luk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'light up' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) with Pt I 3.sg. *lyukā-me*; *wät*ᵃ⁷- 'fight' (?) (m/-/a) (?/V/I) with Pt I 3.pl. *witāre.*[7]

7.1.3.2. *Subclass 2*

Subclass 2 of the non-full vowel *ā*-preterit is characterized by a persistent *ä*-vowel that does not palatalize at all, so we clearly have to

---

[5] The unpalatalized 2.pl.act. *lämās* (S) can be Ipv, see s.v. *läm*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sit', which is a more likely analysis than a Subcl. 4 relict form.

[6] The form may be emended from *märsāne*, but it is quite certain that the original had indeed a 3.sg.mid. *pärsāte* and that *märsane* is a mere copyist's error, because ⟨ma⟩ and ⟨pa⟩ and ⟨na⟩ and ⟨ta⟩ are easy to confuse, see s.v. *pärs*ᵃ-.

[7] For *witāre* (from PT *w'ät-), see the discussion in chap. Sound Laws 1.7.

do with a persistent PT *ä from a PIE zero grade. The Subclass 2 pattern is also confined to Tocharian B. The following stems show it:

*käry*ᵃ- 'buy, trade' (tr) (m/m/x) (Xa/VI/I) Pt I 1.pl. *käryām*, 1.sg.mid. *käryāmai*, 2.sg.mid. *käryātai*, 3.sg.mid. *käryāte*, 1.pl.mid. *käryāmnte*; *kärst*ᵃ- 'cut off, destroy' (tr) (x/x/x) (VI/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *kärstāwa*, 3.sg. *karsta*, 2.sg.mid. *kärstātai*, 3.sg.mid. *kärstāte*; *kälp*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'obtain' (tr) (x/a/a) (IXa/VI/I) Pt I 1.sg. *kälpāwa*, 2.sg. *kälpāsta*, 3.sg. *kalpa*, 1.pl. *kälpām*, 3.pl. *kälpāre/kälpār*; *kul*ᵃ- 'recede' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *k̭ulā-ne*; *pläṅk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'come up, be for sale' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *plaṅka*, 3.pl. *pläṅkāre*; *lit*ᵃ- 'fall' (itr) (m/a/a) (IV/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *lita*; *wätk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'decide, differ' (itr) (-/x/a) (-/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *wätkāwa*, 3.sg. *wätkā* (MQ); *wärs*ᵃ˙ⁱ- '± pity' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I) Pt I 3.sg. *warsa*; *wik*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'disappear' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I)   Pt I 3.sg. *wīka*; *sätk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'spread out' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 3.pl. *sätkāre*; *sälp*ᵃ˙ⁱ- 'glow' (itr) (a+/-/a) (I+II/?/I) Pt I 3.sg. *salpa*.

The following *ā*-preterit stems are difficult to judge with respect to palatalization, because their root-initial consonant cannot indicate palatalization. Note, however, that *cr°* reflecting palatal **tr'°* is indeed attested in the preterit Class II (see chap. Pt II 8.1.5.2.), though never in this class. Roots beginning with *p°* or *m°* are again a different matter, because the writing of *i* instead of *ä* or root-final *-ly-* instead of *-l-* may point to former root-initial palatalization. Where such writings are attested, the respective roots are listed under Subclass 1 (see above) or Subclass 6 (see below), while in this list I give only forms which lack such indication. Roots beginning with *ts-* also do not show palatalization, see chap. Sound Laws 1.2.:

krämp⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be hindered, disturbed' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 2.sg. *krämpāsta*; *trik*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'go astray, be confused' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *trīkā* (MQ); *triw*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be mixed' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 3.pl. *triwāre*; *pärsk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be afraid' (itr) (a/a/a) (V/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *pärska* (MQ), 3.pl. *pärskāre*; *pälsk*ᵃ- 'consider, think' (tr) (x/x/x) (VI/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *palska*, 3.pl. *pälskāre*, 3.sg.mid. *pälskāte*; *pruk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'jump' (itr) (x/-/a) (VI/-/I) Pt I 3.sg. *pruka*; *mäṅk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be inferior, lack' (itr) (m/x/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *mäṅkāwa*, 3.sg. *mäṅkā-ñ*; *märs*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'forget' (tr) (m/x/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *märsāwa*, 2.sg. *märsasta*, 3.sg. *marsa*, 3.pl. *märsāre*; *mäsk*ᵃ- 'be' (itr) (m+/-/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *maska*; *mutk*ᵃ˙ⁱ- 'pour (out)' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I) Pt I 3.pl. *mutkāre-ne*; *musk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'disappear, perish' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *muska*; *yärtt*ᵃ˙ⁱ- 'drag' (tr) (a+/-/a) (I/-/I) Pt I 3.sg. *yärtta-ne* (sic); *yuk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'overcome' (tr) (a/a/a) (VIII/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *yūkāwa*, 3.sg. *yukā-ne*; *räṅk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'ascend' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *raṅka*, 2.pl. *raṅkas*, 3.pl. *räṅkāre* (MQ); *räss*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'tear, pick' (tr) (x/-/x) (II/V/I) Pt I 3.pl. *rässāre*, 3.sg.mid. *rässāte*; *ritt*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be attached to' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *rittāwa*, 3.sg. *ritta*; *sruk*ᵃ- 'die' (itr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *srukāwa*, 3.sg. *sruka*, 1.pl. *srukām*, 2.pl. *srukās*, 3.pl. *srukāre*; *tsäṅk*ᵃ- '(a)rise' (itr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 2.sg. *tsäṅkāsta*,

3.sg. *tsaṅka*; *tsäm*[(a)]- 'grow' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *tsama*; *tsär*[(a)]- 'be separated' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *tsrāwa*; *tsälp*[(a)]- 'pass away, be released' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *tsälpāwa*, 2.sg. *tsälpāsta*, 3.sg. *tsalpa*, 3.pl. *tsälpāre*; *tsit*[ä?]- 'touch' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I) Pt I 3.sg. *tsītā-ne*; *tsuw*[(a)]- 'attach oneself' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/-/I) Pt I 3.sg. *tsuwa*, 3.pl. *tswāre*.

As for *pärk*[ä]- '(a)rise, become clear' (itr) (-/×/a) (-/V/I) with Pt I 2.sg. *pärkasta* (MQ), 3.sg. *parka*, this may belong to Subclass I on account of °*pirko* 'rising (of the sun')', see above and the discussion in chap. Sound Laws 1.7. The two preterit tantum *mä(s)?*- 'go' and *wä(s)?*- 'give' look synchronically like Subclass 2 *ā*-preterits, although they originally started out as *s*-preterits: *mä(s)?*- 'go' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I+III) with Pt I+III 2.sg. *masta*, 3.sg. *masa/massa/msā-ne*; *wä(s)?*- 'give' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I+III) = [A]*wä(s)?*- 'give' with Pt I+III 1.sg. *wsāwa*, 2.sg. *wsāsta*, 3.sg. *wasa/wsā-ne/wsa*, 1.pl. *wasam/wsam*, 3.pl. *wsar-ne/wsar/wsare/wsär-ñi/wäsare/wsāre*, cf. TA Pt I 1.sg. *wsā*, 2.sg. *wsāṣt*, 3.sg. *wäs* beside 3.pl. Pt III TA *wäsr-äṃ*.

7.1.3.3.   Subclass 3

Subclass 3 of the non-full vowel *ā*-preterit is characterized by an ablaut PT *ä in the singular active and PT *æ in the plural active, and most probably PT *ä again in the middle, although no probative middle forms are attested. This type never shows palatalization so that at first sight it seems to attest to an exceedingly odd pre-PT ablaut pattern zero-grade/*o/zero-grade. This type is a regular one only in Tocharian A, the respective TB equivalents are regularly inflected according to the pattern of Subclass 2. For TB remains of Subclass 3, see below 7.1.3.5.

[A]*kälk*[ä]- 'go' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) Pt I 2.sg. *kälkāṣt*, 3.sg. *kälkā-ṃ*, 3.pl. *kalkar* ~ *kālāk*[ä]- (special root structure) Pt I 3.sg. *śalāka*; [A]*klis*[ä]- 'sleep' (itr) (a/a/a) (VI/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *klisā*, 2.sg. *klisāṣt* = *klänts*[(a)]- Subcl. 1 Pt I 3.sg. *klyantsa*; [A]*tkäl*[ä?]- 'illuminate' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I) Pt I 3.sg. *täklā-ṃ*; [A]*lit*[(a)]- 'fall' (itr) (m/×/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *līt* = *lit*[ä]- Subcl. 2 Pt I 3.sg. *lita*; [A]*litk*[(a)]- 'remove' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *litkā-ṃ*; [A]*lip*[(a)]- 'remain, be left over' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I) Pt I 3.sg. *lipā-ci*, 3.pl. *lepar* = *lip*[ä]- Subcl. 6(?) Pt I 3.sg. *lipa/lyīpa*, 3.pl. *lyipāre*; [A]*sätk*[(a)]- 'spread out' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *stäk/sätkā-ṃ*, 3.pl. *satkar* = *sätk*[(a)]- Subcl. 2 Pt I 3.pl. *sätkāre*; [A]*tsälp*[(a)]- 'pass away, be released' (itr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *tsälp*, 2.pl. *tsalpas*, 3.pl. *tsalpar* = *tsälp*[(a)]- Subcl. 2 Pt I 1.sg. *tsälpāwa*, 2.sg. *tsälpāsta*, 3.sg. *tsalpa*, 3.pl. *tsälpāre*.

7.1.3.4.   *Subclass 4*

Subclass 4 of the non-full vowel *ā*-preterit is characterized by palatalizing PT *ä in the singular active, non-palatalizing PT *æ in the plural active, and non-palatalizing PT *ä in the whole middle; we therefore seem to have here an only slightly less strange ablaut pattern pre-PT *e/*o/zero grade. The Subclass 4 pattern is regularly attested in Tocharian A, the TB equivalents usually belong to Subclass 1 (or maybe 6, if the middle is unattested). For TB remains of Subclass 4, see below 7.1.3.5.

Akätk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'cross, pass' (tr/itr) (x/a/a) (VII/V/I) Pt I (tr/itr) 3.sg. *kcäk/śtäk*, 2.pl. *katkas*, 3.pl. *katkar* = *kätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Subcl. 1(/6?) Pt I (tr) 1.sg. *śätkāwa*, 2.sg. *śätkāsta*, 3.sg. *śatka*, 3.pl. *śitkāre*; *Akärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'know, understand, recognize' (tr) (x/x/x) (VI/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *śärsā*, 3.sg. *śärs*, 3.pl. *krasar* (?), 3.sg.mid. *kärsāt* = *kärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* Subcl. 1 Pt I 1.sg. *śärsāwa*, 2.sg. *śärsāsta*, 3.sg. *śarsa*, 3.pl. *śärsāre*, 3.sg.mid. *kärsāte-ne*; *Akälᵃ-* 'lead, bring' (tr) (x/x/x) (VI/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *ślā*, 3.sg. *śäl*, 3.pl. *kalar*, 1.sg.mid. *kle*, 2.sg.mid. *klāte*, 3.sg.mid. *klāt*, 3.pl.mid. *klānt* = *kälᵃ-* Subcl. 1 Pt I 3.sg. *śala*, 3.pl. *śilāre-ne*, 1.sg.mid. *klāmai*, 2.sg.mid. *klātai*, 3.sg.mid. *klāte*, 1.pl.mid. *klāmnte*, 3.pl.mid. *klānte*; *Atärkᵃ-* 'dismiss, emit' (tr) (x/a/a) (VI/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *cärk*, 3.pl. *tarkar* = *tärkᵃ-* Subcl. 1 Pt I 1.sg. *cärkāwa*, 2.sg. *cärkāsta*, 3.sg. *carka*, 3.pl. *cärkāre*, 3.sg.mid. *tärkāte*, 3.pl.mid. *tärkānte*; *Aläm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sit' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *lymā*, 2.sg. *lymāṣt*, 3.sg. *lyäm/lymā-ṃ*, 3.pl. *lamar* = *läm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Subcl. 1 Pt I 2.sg. *lyamāstā* (MQ), 3.sg. *lyama*, 3.pl. *lymāre*, 3.sg.mid. *lmāte*; *Aluᵃ-* 'send' (tr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *lywā*, 2.sg. *lywāṣt*, 3.sg. *lyu/lywā-ṃ*, 3.pl. *lawar* = *luᵃ-* Subcl. 1 Pt I 1.sg. *lywāwa*, 2.sg. *lywāsta/lyuwāsta* (MQ), 3.sg. *lyuwa*; *Aṣtäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'stand' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *śäm/śmā-m*, 3.pl. *ṣtamar* = *stäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Subcl. 4 Pt I 1.sg. *śimāwa*, 2.sg. *śīmasta* (MQ), 3.sg. *śama*, 3.pl. *stamāre/śimāre*, 3.dual *stāmais*; *Atsukᵃ-* 'drink' (tr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *śuk*.

7.1.3.5.   *Remains of Subclasses 3 and 4 in Tocharian B*

The following three Class I preterits of Tocharian B seem to have inflected according to the pattern of Subclasses 3 or 4 still in historical or at least prehistoric Tocharian B:

śuwᵃ- 'eat, consume' (tr) (x/a/x) (V/V/I) Pt I 2.sg. *śawāsta*, 3.sg. *śuwa/śāwa*, 3.pl. *śawāre/śawar*, 3.sg.mid. *śawāte*; *stäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'stand' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *śimāwa/śmāwa*, 2.sg. *ścmasta/śmasta/śīmasta* (MQ), 3.sg. *śama/ścmā-c* (MQ), 3.pl. *stamāre/śimāre*, 3.dual *stāmais* (sic, MQ); *spärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'disappear' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *sparkā-ne* (Š).

spärk⁽ᵃ⁾- is problematic. Apart from *sparkā-ne*, there are two other forms from what looks like a stem allomorph *spārkā-* attested in the Sub (*sparkālye*) and PPt (*sparkoṣ*). A regular Subclass 5 stem with

persistent root vowel (*)-ā- would require a preterit participle of the reduplicated type with *-au, -aṣ* endings, while the formation of the PPt *sparkoṣ* is quite unique (the expected and regular PPt *spärkau, spärkoṣ* is also attested). However, since I am reluctant to dismiss the three forms of the stem allomorph *spārkā-* as mere misspellings, we could have here an existing variation (*)*spärkā/spārkā-* that exactly matches the variation (*)*śuwā-/śāwā-*. In that case, the intrusion of the *ā*-vowel into the root of *sparkālye* and *sparkoṣ* could be analogical.

The highly frequent paradigm of *stäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* has preserved the original distribution of the allomorphs **s't'ämā-/stāmā-* fairly well, whereas with *śuwᵃ̄-* the (*)ā̄ < *æ of the plural stem *śāwā-* shows up in all singular forms known to us except the twice[8] attested informal-style/eastern 3.sg. variant *śuwa*. As for the *æ*-grade active plural forms 3.pl. *rotkär-ne* and 3.pl. *prautkar* with the ending typical of Pt III, see below 7.2.1.1. It will be argued that these attest to an original presence of the *(')ä/æ/ä-pattern as well.

Because the (singular) active is either unattested or the root-initial consonant(s) is/are incapable of indicating palatalization, the following TA roots are unclear with respect to assignment to Subclasses 3 or 4:

ᴬ*kätᵃ̄-* 'strew', ᴬ*kärṣtᵃ̄-* 'cut off', ᴬ*kälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'obtain', ᴬ*kutkᵃ̄?-* 'embody', ᴬ*trik⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be confused, faint', ᴬ*päkᵃ̄-* 'intend', ᴬ*pänwᵃ̄-* 'stretch', ᴬ*pärkᵃ̄-* '(a)rise', ᴬ*pärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sprinkle', ᴬ*pärsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be afraid', ᴬ*pälkᵃ̄-* 'see', ᴬ*pältᵃ̄?-* '± drop', ᴬ*päl(t)skᵃ̄-* 'think', ᴬ*putkᵃ̄-* 'divide', ᴬ*prutk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be shut, filled', ᴬ*märtkᵃ̄-* 'scrape off', ᴬ*märsᵃ̄-* 'forget', ᴬ*mälkᵃ̄-* 'put together', ᴬ*musᵃ̄-* 'rise', ᴬ*musk-* 'disappear', ᴬ*mukᵃ̄?-* 'desist', ᴬ*yäksᵃ̄-* 'entangle', ᴬ*räswᵃ̄-* 'tear, pick', ᴬ*ritᵃ̄-* 'seek', ᴬ*ritw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be attached', ᴬ*rutkᵃ̄-* '(re)move', ᴬ*wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'separate', ᴬ*wärpᵃ̄-* 'enjoy', ᴬ*wä(s)?-* 'give', ᴬ*wik⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'disappear', ᴬ*säkᵃ̄-* '± follow', ᴬ*sätᵃ̄?-* '?', ᴬ*späntᵃ̄-* 'trust', ᴬ*spärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'disappear', ᴬ*tsäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pull', ᴬ*tsär⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be separated', ᴬ*tsit⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'touch', ᴬ*tsuw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'stick together, obey'.

Whenever attested, the singular active and the middle Pt I forms from these roots have as root vowel *-ä-*, and the plural active forms have *-a-* from PT *æ.

For the following non-full vowel roots only middle forms without palatalization are attested, so that they may belong to any of the Subclasses 1-4:

---

kärk^a- 'rob', kärr^a- 'scold', käl(t)s^a- 'pour', käsk^(a)- 'scatter', päk^a- 'intend', mäk^(a)-'run', märtk^a- 'shave', mälk^(a)- '± put (on)', yät^(a)- 'be decorated', räm^a- 'bend, bow', rit^a- 'seek', wär^(a)(sk)- 'smell', wärp^a- 'enjoy', ṣäṃs- 'count', sälk^a- 'pull'.

7.1.3.6. Subclass 5

Subclass 5 is characterized by persistent full vowel (*)-*ā*- (-*ai*-/ TA -*e*-, -*au*-/ TA -*o*-) in the whole *ā*-preterit stem, viz. its members do not show inner-paradigmatic ablaut. However, in Tocharian A such *ā*-preterit formations regularly show weakening of the stem-final (*)-*ā*- by vowel balance, e.g., 3.pl.act. TA *kātkar* < *kātkār.* In both languages, Subclass 5 preterits are regularly associated with a respective *ā*-subjunctive stem that has also a persistent root vowel (*)-*ā*- (-*ai*-/ TA -*e*-, -*au*-/ TA -*o*-). One may further distinguish between Subclass 5 preterits from roots that do not show a root vowel other than (*)-*ā*- (-*ai*-/ TA -*e*-, -*au*-/ TA -*o*-) in Tocharian, and roots that do show a root vowel, or root vowels, other than (*)-*ā*- (-*ai*-/ TA -*e*-, -*au*-/ TA -*o*-) outside of the *ā*-preterit/subjunctive stem. Cf., for example:

kaut^a- 'split, cleave' (tr) (a/x/x) (VI/V/I) Pt I 2.sg. *kautāsta*, 3.sg. *kauta*, 3.sg.mid. *kautāte*, 3.pl. mid. *kautāṃte* = ^A*koṭ^a*- (tr) (a/-/a) (VI/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *kot*, 3.pl. *kotas*.

Subclass 5 preterits from roots that do not show a root vowel other than (*)-*ā*- (-*ai*-/ TA -*e*-, -*au*-/ TA -*o*-) are:

āks^a-'waken', *āmp^a*- 'rot', *ār^(a)*-/ ^A*ār^(a)*- 'cease', *ārt(t)^(a)*-/ ^A*ārt^a*- 'love, praise', ^A*ālp^a*- 'stroke', *ās^(a)*- 'dry', *aiw^(a)*- 'be turned towards', *kāk^a*-/ ^A*kāk^a*- 'call', ^A*kātk^a*- 'arise', *kānts^a*- 'sharpen', *kām^a*-/ ^A*kām^a*- 'carry, take', *kāy^a*- 'open (the mouth)', *kār^a*- 'gather', *kārp^(a)*-/ ^A*kārp^(a)*- 'descend', *kāw^a*-/ ^A*kāp^a*- 'desire', ^A*koṣṭ^a*- 'hit', *kaut^a*-/ ^A*koṭ^a*- 'split', *krās^a*- 'vex, be angry', *kraup^(a)*-/ ^A*krop^(a)*- 'gather', *klāp^a*- '± touch', *klāy^a*-/ ^A*klāw^a*- 'fall', *klāw^(a)*-/ ^A*klāw^a*- 'be called', *klaiks^a*-/ ^A*kleps^a*- 'dry up', ^A*ksā*- '± shine', *tāk^a*-/ ^A*tāk^(a)*- 'be, become', ^A*tāp^a*- 'eat', *trāpp^a*- 'trip', *twāṅk^a*-/ ^A*twāṅk^a*- '± wear', *nān^(a)*- 'appear', ^A*nāsk^a*- 'spin', ^A*pāt^a*- 'plough', *pātk^a*- 'give up', *pāss^a*- 'rip off', *paut^a*- 'honor', *plānt^(a)*-/ ^A*plānt^(a)*- 'rejoice', ^A*plā*- '?', ^A*mālk^a*- 'milk', ^A*māsk^(a)*- 'be difficult', *mrausk^(a)*-/ ^A*mrosk^(a)*- 'feel disgust', *yāṅk^(a)*- 'be deluded', *yāt^(a)*-/ ^A*yāt^(a)*- 'be (cap)able', *yās^(a)*- 'be excited', *yaukk^a*- 'use', *rām^(a)*- 'compare', *lātk^a*-/ ^A*lātk^a*- 'cut off', *wāk^(a)*-/ ^A*wāk^(a)*- 'split', *wāy^a*-/ ^A*wā*- 'lead', *wārk^a*- 'shear', *wārw^(a?)*-/ ^A*wārp^(a?)*- 'prod', *wāl^a*-/ ^A*wāl^a*- 'cover', *wālts^a*- 'crush, grind', *wlāw^a*- 'control', ^A*ṣtār^(a?)*- 'become tired', *sāk^(a)*-/ ^A*sāk^(a)*- 'remain (over)', ^A*skāy^a*- 'strive', *staukk^(a)*- 'swell', *spāw^(a)*- 'subside', *tsāk^a*- 'pierce', *tsāp^a*- 'mash, squeeze', *tsārw^(a)*-/ ^A*tsārw^(a)*- 'be comforted', *tsālt^a*- 'chew'.

The following roots are attested so rarely that the absence of forms with a root vowel other than (*)-*ā*- (-*ai*-/ TA -*e*-, -*au*-/ TA -*o*-) can hardly be significant:

^Apew^{a?}- 'card' (only Pt I stem attested); *r(·)w^{a?}*- '± despair' (only Pt I stem attested, and the root vowel is damaged); *^Awār^{a?}*- 'wake up' (only PPt attested); *^Awek^a*- 'fall apart' (no Prs attested); *^Asām^{a?}*- 'gather' (no Prs, Sub attested).

The following Subclass 5 preterits are made from roots that do show a root vowel, or root vowels, other than (*)-*ā*- (-*ai*-/ TA -*e*-, -*au*-/ TA -*o*-) outside of the *ā*-subjunctive/preterit:

(1) Roots showing a root vowel other than (*)-*ā*- (-*ai*-/ TA -*e*-, -*au*-/ TA -*o*-) in verbal stem formations other than Sub V/Pt I of the very same root in the very same branch (evidence coming mostly from the respective present stem). Here belong:

klautk^(a)- 'turn, become' (itr) (m/a/a) (IV/V/I) ~ *^Alotk^a*- (itr) (a/a/a) (VII/V/I) with Pt I 3.sg. *klautka*, etc. = TA Pt I 3.sg. *lotäk*, etc. but cf. the obviously related root *klutk^(a)*- 'turn, become'/ *^Alutk^{(a)?}*- 'make, turn into'; *^Atrāsk^a*- 'chew' (tr) (-/a/-) (-/V/I) with Pt I in the PPt *tāträskus* but TB Prs II *treṣṣäṃ*; *nitt^(a)*- 'collapse' (itr) (a/-/a) (IoV/V/I) with Pt I 3.sg. *naitta-c* (MQ), 3.pl. *naittāre* (MQ) but Prs V 3.sg. *nittaṃ*; *nu^(a)*- 'cry' (tr) (m/x/m) (III/V/I)[9] with Pt I 2.sg.mid. *nawatai* (MQ) but Prs III 3.sg.mid. *ñewetär*; *naut^(a)*- 'disappear' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) ~ *^Anut^(a)*- (itr) (-/?/-) (-/V/I) with Pt I 3.sg. *nautā-ne*, 3.pl. *nautare-ṃ* (MQ) but TA Pt I in the PPt *nuto*; *päl^a*- 'praise' (tr) (m/m/m) (VI/V/I) = *^Apäl^a*- (tr) (m/m/m) (VI/V/I) with Pt I 1.sg. *palāmai*, etc. = TA Pt I 3.sg. *pālat*, etc. but TB/TA Prs VI stem *pällā*-; *pik^a*- 'paint, write' (tr) (a+/m/x) (VII/V/I) = *^Apik^a*- (tr) (x/m/x) (I/V/I) with Pt I 3.sg. *paiyka*, etc. = TA Pt I (x) 3.pl. *pekar*, etc. but TB Prs VII 3.sg. *piṅkäṃ*, etc., TA Prs I 3.sg. *pikäṣ*; *^Apiw^a*- 'blow' (tr) (a/-/-) (V/-/I) with Pt I in the PPt *pāpeyu* but Prs V 3.sg. TA *piwāṣ*; *mān(t)s^(a)*-'be sorrowful' (itr) (m/m/m) (II-VI/II-V/I) with Pt I 3.sg. *mantsāte* but Prs/Sub II stem *memṣ/s*-, Prs VI stem *māntsänā*-; *mänt^(a)*- 'stir; destroy; be angry' (tr/itr) (x/x/a) (VI-XII/V/I) = *^Amänt^a*- (tr/itr) (x/-/m) 'id.' (V/V/I) with Pt I 1.sg. *mantāwa*, etc. = TA Pt I 3.sg.mid. *māntat*, etc. but TB Prs VI stem *mintänā*-, Prs XII stem *mäntäññ*-, TA Prs V stem *mäntā*-; *miw^(a)*- 'tremble, quake' (itr) (x/-/x) (I-XII/V/I) with Pt I 3.sg. *maiwa*, etc. but Prs I 3.sg. *miwäṃ*, Prs XII stem *miwäññ*-; *mauk^(a)*- 'refrain from, desist' (itr) (-/a/x) (-/V/I) with Pt I 2.sg. *maukāsta*, etc. but *^Amuk^{a?}*- (itr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I) (Subcl. 3 or 4); *^Ayär^(a)*- 'bathe; purge' (?) (—) (X/-/I) with Pt I in the PPt attested by TA *yāyrurāṣ* but

---

[9] Diachronically, the root probably inflected according to Subcl. 3, thereby simply following the model of rhyming *śuw^a*- 'eat', as can be guessed from Sub V *nuwaṃ*. Note that *nawatai* cannot simply be due to omission of a vowel stroke (†*nuwatai*), because ⟨nu⟩ has a different structure.

Inf TA *yärnässi*; *räk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'extend oneself (over)' (itr) (-/m/-) (-/V/I) with Pt I in the PPt *rarākau* but Antigv. Prs VIII 1.sg. *raksau*, etc.; ᴬ*räpᵃ-* 'dig, plow' (tr) (-/-/a) (V/V/I) with Pt I 3.sg. *rāp* but Prs V Inf TA *rpātsi*; *lik⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'wash' (tr) (m/m/m) (VI/V/I) = ᴬ*likᵃ-* (tr) (-/a/-) (I/V/I) Pt I 3.sg.mid. *laikāte*, etc. = TA Pt I in the PPt TA *lāleku* but Prs VIII 3.sg.mid. *likṣtär*, TA Prs I Inf TA *līktsi*; *lup⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'rub; throw into' (tr) m/a/x) (VIII/V/I) = ᴬ*lupᵃ-* (tr) (—) (-/V/I) with Pt I 3.pl. *laupāre*, etc. = TA Pt I in the PPt *lālupu* but TB Prs VIII 3.sg.mid. *lupṣtär*; *luk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'light up, be illuminated' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) with Pt I in the PPt attested by *lalaukarne* but finite Pt I 3.sg. *lyukā-me*; ᴬ*wāmpᵃˀ-* 'decorate' (tr) (m/-/m) (II/-/I) with Pt I 1.sg.mid. *wāmpe* but 3.sg.mid. Prs I/II TA *wamtär* (sic); *wāsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'stir' (itr) (m/-/m) (XII/V/I) = ᴬ*wāsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* (itr) (m/-/m) (VII/V/I) with Pt I 2.sg.mid. *waskātai*, etc. = TA Pt I 3.sg.mid. TA *wāskat* but TB Prs XII stem *wäskäññ-* beside *wāskäññ-*; ᴬ*wniskᵃ-* '± crush, torment' (tr) (a/-/-) (VII/-/I) with Pt I in the PPt TA *wāwneskunt* but 3.sg. Prs VII TA *wnisäṅkāṣ*; *säl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'fly, arise' (itr) (-/-/m) (-/-/I) = ᴬ*säl⁽ᵃ⁾-* (itr) (a+/-/-) (I/-/I) with Pt I 3.sg.mid. *salāte-ne* = TA Pt I in the PPt TA *sāslumt* but TA Prs I 3.pl. TA *sliñc*, etc.; *sāmp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'take away' (tr) (m/-/m) (IXa/V/I) ~ ᴬ*sumᵃ-* (tr) (m+/-/-) (VI/V/-) with Pt I 3.sg.mid. *sampāte*, etc. but Prs IXa *sompastär*, etc.; ᴬ*sipᵃ-* 'anoint' (tr) (m/-/-) (IoII/V/I) with Pt I in the PPt *sāsepu* but TA Prs I/II Inf TA *siptsi*, etc.; *skärᵃ-* 'scold, threaten' (tr) (a+/a/x) (VI/V/I) with Pt I 3.sg. *skarāre-ne*, etc. but Prs VI 3.sg. *skarraṃ*; *spārtt⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'turn; behave; be' (itr) (m/x/a) (IV/V/I) = ᴬ*spārtw⁽ᵃ⁾-* (itr) (x/a/a) (II-IV/V/I) with Pt I 1.sg. *spartāwa*, etc. = TA Pt I 1.sg. *spārtwā*, etc. but TB Priv *eṣpirtacce*, etc.; ᴬ*tsārtᵃˀ-* 'weep' (itr) (m/-/a) (IoII/-/I) with Pt I 1.sg. TA *tsārtā*, etc. but Prs I/II TA *śertmāṃ*; *tsikᵃ-* 'form' (tr) (-/a/m) (I/V/I) = ᴬ*tsikᵃˀ-* (tr) (—) (-/-/I) with Pt I 3.pl.mid. *tsaikānte*, etc. = TA Pt I in the PPt TA *tsātseku* but TB Prs I Ger I *tsikale* (sic); *tsuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* '± suck (out)' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/V/I) = ᴬ*tsukᵃ-* 'drink' (Subcl. 4) with Pt I 3.sg. *tsaukā-c* (MQ) but Antigv. Prs VIII *tsukseṃ*, etc.

The following two roots are special cases:

ᴬ*twᵃ-*/ᴬ*twās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'burn' (?) (a/a/-) (VIII/V/I) with TA Pt I *twāsā-* in the PPt TA *tātwsu* (probably TB Pt I *täwā-* in the PPt *twoṣ*); *suwᵃ-* /*swās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'rain' (itr) (a+/a/a) (V/V/I) = ᴬ*suw⁽ᵃ⁾-* /ᴬ*swās⁽ᵃ⁾-* (itr) (a+/-/a) (I/V/I) with Pt I 3.sg. *swāsa* = TA Pt I (a) 3.pl. *swāsar*.

In spite of nominal *swese*/ TA *swase* 'rain', the root variants in PT *-ā/æs(ā)-* are based on reanalysis of old 3.sg.act. Pt III forms in (*)-*āsā-*, according to Peters, 2006, 336, fn. 17.

Here most probably also belongs the 2.sg.act. *pāyāsta* (MQ) from *piᵃ-* '± trumpet' which is rather Pt I than Pt II given the coexistence of a Sub V with persistent *ā*-vowel in the root; the 3.pl.act. *yastāre* (sic) from *yästˀ-* 'hurl down' may also belong here if the root is set up correctly (see the discussion s.v. *yästˀ-*).

(2) Roots that show root vowels other than (*)-*ā*- exclusively in related nominal formations:

klāṅk^a- 'go by wagon' (but *kleṅke* 'vehicle'); *wārp^(a?)*- 'surround' (but *werpiśke* 'garden'), *spālk^(a?)*- '± strive for' (but *spel(t)ke* 'zeal'). *wāp^a*-/ ^A*wāp^a*- 'weave' shows *æ*-vowel in *wepe* '± corral, paddock', and *ä*-vowel at least in the nominal form *wpelme* 'cobweb'; but note that there may also be a present-stem allomorph **wäp*- attested, see the discussion s.v. *wāp^a*-/ ^A*wāp^a*- 'weave' and ^A*wäp^(a?)*- '?'.

7.1.3.7. *Subclass 6*

The TB *ā*-preterit of *nätk^a*- 'hold off, push away' shows a palatalizing *ä*-vowel in the whole active as well as in the middle, so one may set up a special class for it: 3.sg. *ñätka* (MQ), 3.pl. *ñitkāre-ne*, 2.sg.mid. *ñätkatai* (sic, MQ). Note that the respective PPt *nätkau* is not palatalized. Irregular in a similar way, although not strictly parallel, is *lip^a*- 'remain, be left over' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I) with Pt I 3.sg *lipa/lyīpa*, 3.pl. *lyipāre.* Note that variation between root-initial *ly* and *l* is also to be seen in the present stem of this root.

7.1.3.8. *Subclass 7*

Under this subclass I subsume all Pt I forms belonging to paradigms that show a seemingly palatalizing root vowel (*)-*ā*- throughout the whole active and middle; the respective PPt is typically of the shape C'eC'Cu, C'eC'Coṣ. This kind of formation is attested in the function of a preterit only in Tocharian B, although Tocharian A has a number of imperfects such as TA *lyāk* that must be of the same origin, as already noticed by TG, 385, § 462, fn. 1.

kālāk^a- 'follow' (tr) (m/-/a) (I/-/I) Pt I 3.sg. *śalāka* but PPt *kakālakaṣ; pälw^a*- 'lament' (tr/itr) (a+/-/a) (V/V/I) Pt I 3.sg. *plyāwa*, 3.pl. *plyawāre*, PPt in *pepälyworsa; läk^(a)*- 'see, look' (tr) (x/x/x) (IXa-V/V/I) Pt I 1.sg. *lyakāwa*, 2.sg. *lyakāsta*, 3.sg. *lyakā-ne*, 1.pl. *lyakām*, 2.pl. *lyakāso*, 3.pl. *lyakāre/lyakār-ne*, 2.sg.mid. *lyakātai*, 3.sg.mid. *lyakāte*, 3.pl.mid. *lyakānte-me/lyākāṃte*, PPt *lyelyku*, *lyelykoṣ/lyelyäkoṣ* (MQ), *lyelyakor/lyelykor/lelkor; lu^?*- 'rub' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I) Pt I 3.sg. *lyawā-ne*, PPt in *lyelyuwormeṃ; säl^(a)*- Antigv. 'throw' (tr) (-/-/x) (-/II/I) Pt I 2.sg. *ṣalāsta*, 3.sg. *ṣālla*, 3.pl. *ṣallāre/ṣalāre*, 2.sg.mid. *ṣalātai*, 3.sg.mid. *ṣallāte*, PPt *sesalyu* (MQ); *stäm^(a)*- Kaus. I 'put, place' (tr) (a/-/x) (IXb/IXb/I-II-IV) Pt I 1.sg. *ṣṭamāwa.*

Subclass 7 *ā*-preterits are, of course, strongly reminiscent of Class II preterits; however, both formations have to be kept apart synchronically for the following two reasons: first, Subclass 7 forms

do not always have the same semantics as the respective kausativum present, which is especially true for *lyakāwa*; second, the Subclass 7 forms do not have initial accent, which is another typical trait of Pt II forms.[10]

Subclasses 1 and 2 are restricted to Tocharian B, while Subclasses 3 and 4, which are the regular TA equivalents of TB Subclasses 2 and 1, are not completely confined to Tocharian A, but are sporadically also attested in Tocharian B. Since in addition the ablaut patterns of Subclasses 1 and 2 are simpler ones, it can be safely assumed that Tocharian B has innovated, i.e., that Tocharian B has usually generalized the stem allomorph first restricted to the singular active through the whole active paradigm, cf. Adams, 1978, 284 and 1988a, 90. The TB paradigm of the frequent verbal root *stäm*[(a)]- 'stand' still directly shows an active plural and a dual form with æ-grade (3.pl. *stamāre*, 3.du. *stāmais*), *stamāre* being the exact equivalent of TA 3.pl. *ṣtamar* < PT *stæmā-. Now it is interesting that an undoubtedly younger 3.pl. Pt variant *śimāre* showing the usual generalization of the original singular active stem is attested in an eastern text.[11] This does not seem odd on first glance, because the eastern variety of Tocharian B does show many traits of the informal or more progressive styles of Tocharian B, and it is also precisely the eastern variety where the relic form 3.sg. *śuwa* instead of standard *śāwa* from *śuw*[ä]- 'eat' is found, which is another TB preterit stem that directly attests to the Subclass 3/4 ablaut. The variation of standard *stamāre* vs. eastern/informal *śimāre* can be explained by assuming that while a verb of high frequency like *stäm*[(a)]- was morphologically conservative in the standard TB variety, the more progressive styles simplified the formerly more complex ablaut pattern even of this frequent verb to a less complex one. It is not so clear to me whether the preservation of the old ablaut in *śuwa*, *prautkar*, and *rotkär-ne* in the eastern/informal variety may have been helped by influence from Tocharian A, because while influence of Tocharian A on the most eastern TB variety cannot a priori be excluded (see Malzahn, 2007a, 289f.), some attestations come from western or central texts. Otherwise, one must assume that

---

[10] Therefore, *lyakāwa* cannot be analyzed as a Pt II as has been done by Saito, 2006, 182.

[11] On the *ä*-epenthesis and further change of *ä* > *i* in this form see Peyrot, 2008, 55 and 57; both sound changes are traits of the informal/eastern variety of TB as well.

the most progressive variety of Tocharian B (or chronologically latest period, as per Peyrot, 2008) could on the other hand preserve morphological archaisms.

7.1.4. *The formation of the preterit participle*

The PPt of Subclasses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 are always non-reduplicated, have the zero grade of the root and as endings in Tocharian B nom.sg. *-au* (standard), *-o͡u* (MQ), obl. *-oṣ*; their root initial is usually non-palatalized, even if the PPt belongs to a Pt I of Subclass 1 or 4, as, e.g., *tärko͡u*, *tärkoṣ*, or of Subclass 6 (*nätkowo*). In contrast, the PPts belonging to Subclass 5 are always reduplicated, have always (*)-*ā*- as reduplication and root vowel and as endings *-au*, *-aṣ* in Tocharian B (e.g., *lalaikau*). The PPt to Subclass 7, which is only attested in Tocharian B, is reduplicated with the vowel *-e-*, has *ä* as root vowel, and seems to have palatalized root-initial consonants (e.g., *lyelyku*).

7.1.5. *Class I preterits from roots with non-A-character*

This type is attested in both languages and is made from both full-vowel and non-full vowel roots. It is characterized by the fact that all roots showing this kind of formation lack A-character, which means that the Pt I shows a suffixal PT (*)-ā-.[12] The Pt I synchronically paired with a Class II subjunctive is further characterized by palatalization of the root-final consonant (cluster) like *klyauṣa* or, in the case of *campya*, by insertion of a *-y-* immediately before the suffixal PT (*)-ā-.

---

[12] Very few roots for which a Sub I is attested or can be presupposed have a Pt I, which is not palatalized like the type discussed in the following. Usually, roots with Sub I form a Pt III, not Pt I. The exceptions are: *Aplu-* 'fly, soar' (I/-/I) (-/-/a) and *pälk-* 'shine' (I/-/I) (a/-/a)/ *Apälk-* (I/-/I) (a/-/a). Even though a Sub I is not attested for any of these two cases, it can easily be presupposed with regard to Prs I (in the TB cognate *plu-* the Sub I is actually attested, though this has the expected Pt III; but note also that TA *plawar* from *Aplu-* 'fly, soar' may in theory belong to the type *klyauṣa*, because TA *-w-* could go back to PT *-w'-). Here may further also belong *sāmp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'deprive' if the Prs stem *sompäsk-* reflects a former athematic stem *sæmpu- < *sæmpä-, see chap. Sound Laws 1.6. On the other hand, it would have been surprising if athematic stems should not have formed Pt I stems in the first place, because it seems that the alternative, i.e., *s-*preterit stems, rather have an affinity with the *s-present* and not with a particular subjunctive stem.

The respective PPts lack the final PT (*)-ā- of the indicative forms, but usually share their root-final palatalization. Unfortunately, no PPt is attested for *cämp-*. This type should be viewed together with the preterits of Classes IV, V, and VII, which also have (*)-ā- attached either to a stem ending in a palatalized consonant (cluster) or in a -*y*-. For the kind of Tocharian roots involved, see Jasanoff, 1987, 95f. and Peters, 2006, 340: "Die zugehörigen themat. Konj. bzw. die zugrundeliegenden themat. Präs. setzen dabei niemals idg. Wurzelpräs., sondern vielmehr ausnahmslos idg. suffigierte Präs.-Stämme fort, auch bei den einsilbigen Konj.-Stämmen handelt es sich durchwegs um alte Suffixbildungen, und zwar um solche mit den idg. Suffixen *-s-, *-sk̂- und *-u̯-; solchen Präs.-Stämmen konnten in älterer Zeit entweder überhaupt keine oder allenfalls formal weit abliegende Aoriststämme entsprochen haben" — but, of course, there was one exception, *campya*, which derives from a PIE root *√temp and to which corresponds a TA Pt III *campäs*. Generally speaking, one can say that almost all Tocharian roots forming a Sub II have a *klyauṣa*-type Pt I if they have a Pt I at all.[13]

āks- 'announce' (tr) (a+/x/a) (XI/II/I) Pt I 1.sg. *akṣāwa*, 2.sg. *akṣāsta*, 3.sg. *ākṣa*, 3.pl. *akṣāre*, PPt *ākṣu/ ākṣoṣ*; *kātk-* 'rejoice, be glad' (itr) (a+/-/a) (II/II/I) Pt I 3.pl. *kaccāre*, PPt *kakāccu/ kakāccoṣ*; *kärsk-* 'shoot (an arrow)' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I)[14] Pt I 3.sg. *karṣṣa*, PPt *kekarṣṣu*; *klyaus-* 'hear, listen to' (tr) (x/a/x) (II/II/I) Pt I 1.sg. *klyauṣāwa*, 3.sg. *klyauṣa*, 2.pl. *klyauṣāso*, 3.pl. *klyauṣāre*, 2.sg.mid. *klyauṣātai*, 3.sg.mid. *klyauṣāte*, PPt *keklyauṣu/ keklyauṣoṣ* = ᴬ*klyos-* (tr) (x/a/a) (II-Xa/II/I) Pt I 1.sg. *klyoṣā*, 3.sg. *klyoṣ*, 1.pl. *klyoṣāmäs*, 2.pl. *klyoṣās*, 3.pl. *klyoṣār*, PPt *kaklyuṣu*; *cämp-* 'be able to' (itr) (a/a/a) (II/II/I) Pt I 1.sg. *cämyāwa*, 2.sg. *cimpyāsta*, 3.sg. *campya*, 2.pl. *cämpyās*, 3.pl. *cämpyāre*; *ñäsk-* 'demand, desire' (tr) (x/a/a) (II/II/I-II) Pt I 3.sg. *ñaṣṣa/ñiṣṣā-me*; *tränk-*

---

[13] The few exceptions are: *kraup*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'gather', which forms both a thematic Sub II and a Sub V standing beside a Prs VI, so the root basically had A-character. *tās-* 'put' synchronically forms a subjunctive of Class II, and an unpalatalized *ā*-preterit beside an *s*-preterit, the *s*-preterit certainly being the original class, so that we are originally dealing with a Prs VIII and not Prs II. For the reanalysis process of forming *ā*-preterits from former *s*-preterit stems for roots in final -*s*. As for Pt *yasāte*, contrarily to the analysis in WTG, 275 and TEB II, 227, 3.sg. Pt *yasāte* in 366 b 3 attested in a quite fragmentary passage may rather belong to *yās*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'be excited', see s.v. *yās*⁽ᵃ⁾*-*. On the other hand, *tränk-* 'lament' has a thematic subjunctive beside the athematic one, and it forms a palatalized Pt I of the type *klyauṣa*.

[14] Note that analysis as a member of this class is applied precisely because the Pt I and PPt show palatalization, while the nominal TA cognate °*krase* attests to the root structure *kärsk-*.

'lament' (tr) (-/a/a) (I/I-II/I) Pt I 3.sg. *trāñcā-neś*; *nāsk-* 'bathe, swim' (itr) (a+/a/a) (II/II/I) Pt I 3.sg. *nāṣṣa*, PPt *nanāṣṣūsa*; *pāsk-* 'protect, obey' (tr) (m+/x/m) (II/II/I) Pt I 1.sg.mid. *paṣṣāmai*, 2.sg.mid. *paṣṣatai* (MQ), 3.pl.mid. *paṣṣānte*, PPt *papāṣṣu/ papāṣṣoṣ* = *ᴬpās-* (tr) (m+/m/m) (II/II/I) Pt I 2.sg.mid. *pāṣāte*, 3.sg.mid. *pāṣāt*, PPt *pāpṣu*; *yāsk-* 'beg' (tr) (m/m/m) (IXa/II/I) Pt I 2.sg.mid. *yaṣṣātai*, 3.sg.mid. *yaṣṣāte-ne*, PPt *yayāṣṣoṣ*; *yārs-* 'show respect' (itr) (m/-/m) (II/II/I) Pt I 1.sg.mid. *yārṣāmai*, 3.sg.mid. *yārṣāte*, 3.pl.mid. *yirṣānte* = *ᴬyārs-* (itr) (m/m/m) (II/II/I) Pt I 3.pl.mid. *yārṣānt*; *lāṃs-* 'work on, perform' (tr) (m/m/m) (II/II/I) Pt I 1.sg.mid. *laṃṣāmai*, 2.sg.mid. *laṃṣātai*, 3.sg.mid. *laṃṣāte/laṃṣṣāte* (S), 3.pl.mid. *laṃṣānte/laṃṣṣānte*, PPt *lalāṃṣuwa/ lalāṃṣaṣ* (sic); *wäsk-* '?' (?) (-/-/a) (-/-/I)[15] Pt I 3.pl. *wäṣṣāre*; *ᴬwles-* 'perform' (tr) (m+/x/m) (II/II/I) Pt I 1.sg.mid. *wleṣe*, 3.sg.mid. *wleṣāt*, 3.pl.mid. *wleṣānt*, PPt *wāwleṣu*; *śāw-* 'live' (itr) (a+/a/a) (II/II/I-VII) Pt I 3.sg. *śāya* = *ᴬśāw-* 'live' (itr) (a+/a/-) (II/II/I) Pt I in PPt *śāśo*; *ṣäṃs-* 'count' (tr) (x/-/m) (II/II/I) Pt I 3.sg.mid. *ṣäṃṣāte.* Probably *sār?-/ᴬsār?-* 'plant'?

Although there is no palatalization (or *y*-insertion) visible, synchronically here certainly also belongs *soy-* 'become sated, satisfied' (itr) (a/a/a) (II/II/I) with Pt I 3.pl. *soyāre* and PPt *sosoyu/ sosoyoṣ.* This is not only recommended by the pairing of Sub II with Pt I, but also by the formation of the PPt.

Note that 3.sg. Pt I TA *klyoṣ*[16] clearly differs from what must have been the 3.sg. active of the respective imperfect of Class III, i.e., TA (*)*klyoṣā*,[17] the final *-ā* of which is the invariable and ubiquitous surface *-ā-* typical of the Class III imperfects of Tocharian A. The 1.sg. active endings of the imperfect and preterit also differ (TA *-āwā* vs. TA *-ā*), though the only root for which in Tocharian A both an Imp III and this kind of preterit stem is attested is *ᴬklyos-*.[18]

---

[15] Analysis as a member of this class is based on morphological considerations.

[16] Attested with certainty in A 436 b 4.

[17] To be sure, all instances of TA *klyoṣā* are ambiguous with respect to both number of person (1.sg. or 3.sg.) and tense (preterit or imperfect), with the one exception of A 20 a 6 and b 3, where TA *klyoṣā* must be a 1.sg. preterit. However, a 3.sg.act. Imp from this root could not have been any other form than TA *klyoṣā.*

[18] The 2.pl.act. Imp TA *klyoṣās* is arguably attested in YQ 42 a 6 (Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 79). The 3.pl. TA *klyoṣār* in A 81 a 61 is preterit rather than imperfect (see Thomas, 1957, 240), and the same seems to be true for TA *klyoṣār* in A 436 b 3 (although the passage is fragmentary); the 1.pl. *klyoṣāmäs* in A 340 a 6 is likewise preterit (see Thomas, 1957, 216). All clear instances of forms from the stems TA *pāṣā-* from *ᴬpās-* 'protect', and TA *wleṣā-* from *ᴬwles-* 'perform' are also rather preterits.

Finally, it must be stressed that if *campya* is to be taken as a lautgesetzlich form, it can only be the outcome of a pre-PT *temp̦i̦ā.[19] Therefore, whoever thinks that *klyauṣa*, etc. and *campya* belong together both synchronically and diachronically, must derive *klyauṣa*, etc. from formations in pre-PT *-i̦ā-. Actually, Krause and Thomas (WTG, 165, § 164,1; TEB I, 241, § 434,1) proposed that *campya* is indeed a representative of a PIE *-i̦ā- preterit, but assumed that it was almost the only member of its class.[20]

7.1.6. *Summary*

The basic *ā*-preterit types are:

	Subcl. 4 (→ TB Sucl. 1)	Subcl. 3 (→ TB Subcl. 2)	Subcl. 5	Subcl. 7	*klyauṣa*
Sg.act.	*s't'äm-ā°	*kälp-ā°	*pāl-ā°	*l'āk-ā°	*kl'æws'-(y)ā°
Pl.act.	*stæm-ā°	*kælp-ā°	*pāl-ā°	*l'āk-ā°	*kl'æws'-(y)ā°
Mid.	*stäm-ā°	*kälp-ā°	*pāl-ā°	*l'āk-ā°	*kl'æws'-(y)ā°
PPt	*stäm-å°	*kälp-å°	*pæ-pāl-ā°	*l'æ-l'äk-ā°	*kæ-kl'æws'-(y)ä°

7.2.   MIXED PARADIGMS AND CHANGE OF PRETERIT CLASS

7.2.1. *The 3.pl. active*

The 3.pl.act. endings of the Pt I are *-āre*, TA *-ar* (both from PT *-āræ), whereas in Pt III we find the endings *-är* (*-ar* under the accent), TA *-är* (probably both from PT *-ärä); on the diachronic explanation see chap. Endings.[21]

---

[19] It is impossible to derive *campya* from a three-syllabic form PT *t'ämpäyā (as per VW II/2, 132 or quite recently Kim, 2003), which would have resulted in TB †*cämp(ĭ)yā*, and there is no trace of a trisyllabic †*cämpĭyā*, even though the root is attested quite often.

[20] As for the (non-)existence of an "eigenen Präteritaltyp auf (*)yā(-)", see Peters, 2006, 341, fn. 32.

[21] There are two instances of *-ere* instead of *-āre* (Pt I *paiykere* in a graffito and Pt IV *yamaṣṣere* in the ordination text KVāc), and one of *-ire* (Pt I *plänkire* in a business document). It is difficult to judge whether these forms are mere writing errors or attest to some informal-style development, see Peyrot, 2008, 146f.

Some forms, however, do not conform to this pattern. In this respect one has to distinguish between 3.pl. active Pt I forms simply lacking the final -*e* and cases of TB -*ar*/-*är* instead of -*āre*. Instances of simple lack of final -*e* are further to be divided into cases with a following enclitic pronoun and cases without following clitic. The same variants are also attested for the 3.pl. active of Pt II, Pt IV, and Pt V,[22] cf. WTG, 155, § 156, 4a; TEB I, 242, § 435,2; Winter, 1965a, 208 = 1984, 175 = 2005, 133, fn. 1; Peyrot, 2008, 132ff.; Pinault, 2008, 188f. In PK AS 18B b 4 such an absence is attested for forms of both 3.pl.act. Pt I and Pt IV:

tu alye(k) lyakār-me (Pt I) *śnonasa cotit yamaṣṣar-me* (Pt IV) "ils virent leur action autrement qu'un [simple] divertissement, [et] les accusèrent à cause des femmes" (Pinault, 2008, 78f.). There are also quite a few cases of -*ār* without following pronoun, some of them even written with virāma -*ār*͵ and metrically guaranteed:

3.pl.act. Pt I *kälpār*͵ from *kälp*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'obtain' in 430 b 4 (M);[23] 3.pl.act. Pt I *klautkār*͵ in 583 a 2 (M)[24] from *klautk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'turn'; 3.pl.act. *cirār* from *tär*ᵃˀ- '± stretch' in PK NS 38 + 37 a 1 (Pinault, 1988a, 194f.); 3.pl.act. Pt I *pilykār* in 429 b 2 (S) from *pälk*ᵃ- 'see'; 3.pl.act. Pt I *putkār*͵ from *putk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'divide' in the business document SI P/117, 2 (Pinault, 1998, 15); 3.pl.act. Pt I *śawār* from *śuw*ᵃ- 'eat' in the business document SI B Toch./9, 12f. (Pinault, 1998, 4). Finally, TochSprR(B) proposed restoration to a 3.pl.act. Pt I *(klyauṣ)ār* in 429 b 2 (S), which makes sense in the context and would provide an exact parallel for the *e*-less 3.pl.act. Pt I *pilykār* found in the same manuscript.

With the exception of *cirār* in PK NS 38 + 37 a 1, which is a text of unknown provenance, all these *e*-less 3.pl. active Pt I and Pt V forms are either attested in business documents or in texts of eastern provenance. Consequently, the absence of -*e* in this 3.pl. active ending is an informal-style feature and for this reason to be viewed together with the numerous progressive phonological traits of that variety, i.e., we have here a case of reduction of *æ to *ä typical of the informal styles. It is conceivable that the loss of -*e* started in forms with a

---

[22] The often attested Pt of *we-ñ-* shows the most variation: *weñāre*, *wñāre*, *weñāre-neś* (S), *weñār-mes* (S), *wñār-ne* (S), and even *weñār*͵ without following clitic in THT 1453 b 2 (S).

[23] Though damaged, the form cannot be restored to an Ipv form //// *(p)kälpār*, and an imperative would not make sense in this passage at all.

[24] Here, again, it is impossible to restore a damaged form in -*ār*, //// *klautkār*͵ • , in this case to an imperative.

following clitic and was from these cases generalized to forms without clitic.

This variation of formal *-āre* vs. informal *-ār* then may have caused, via hypercorrection, the introduction of an additional *-e* into the 3.pl. active ending of the *s*-preterit, as evidenced by, e.g., *plyeṅkare* from *pläṅk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'sell' in a Paris business document (see Schmidt, 1986a, 648). In concordance with the hypercorrection hypothesis, the *s*-preterit 3.pl. active forms in *-re*, too, are confined to the informal styles and the eastern TB variety (where we find *tesare*, *maitare*, and *wsare*), see Schmidt, l.c.; Peyrot, 2008, 134; and chap. Pt III 9.1.3.

7.2.1.1. *prautkar and rotkär-ne*

The 3.pl.act. Pt I forms *prautkar* from *prutk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be shut, filled' and *rotkär-ne* from *rutk*ᵃ- '(re)move' deserve a different treatment,[25] because instead of a simple loss of *-e* we seem to have here the genuine 3.pl. active ending of the *s*-preterit *-är* (*-ar* under the accent). An interpretation as *prautkár* is, of course, far more likely than one as †*práutkär*, especially with regard to *rotkär-ne*. In addition, *prautkar* and *rotkär-ne* show an unexpected full vowel in the root. *prautkar* is attested in the metrical passage 108 b 6 (S). Both forms hence look like *s*-preterits, but they cannot be genuine *s*-preterit forms, since they semantically and syntactically belong to the grundverb. And although *prautkar* is attested in an eastern text, *rotkär-ne* is not. However, *rotkär-ne* in 51 a 5 (Š) shows monophthongizations *au > o*, which is a sound change typical of the informal styles. Therefore, this form may be an informal-style variant as well, even though it is, strictly speaking, not an eastern-dialect variant. Accordingly, the ablaut grade is hardly merely due to the influence of neighboring Tocharian A. Therefore, the most likely explanation is that *prautkar* and *rotkär-ne* really do reflect the old ablaut grade *æ typical of the 3.pl. active forms of Subclasses 3 or 4, i.e., we should assume 3.pl. †*prautkāre* < *præwtkāræ = TA *protkar*, which is indeed communis opinio (TEB I,

---

[25] The 3.pl. Pt *arar-c* in 45 a 1 is, on the other hand, not an example of a Pt I form that took on the Pt III ending (thus WTG, 221), but a genuine, transitive *s*-preterit, i.e., an antigrundverb form, see the discussion and ref. s.v. *ār*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'cease', and also chap. Pt III. As for the hapax *särpar ka* in 119 a 4 (MQ), which is also analyzed by WTG, 298 as a Pt I form, we simply cannot be sure (although it must be said that in a Pt III form one would not have expected a non-palatalizing root vowel *-ä*-; see the discussion in chap. Pt III).

238, § 430,4; Winter, 1965a, 208 = 1984, 175 = 2005, 133; Adams, 1978, 284; Hilmarsson, 1991, 164; Peters, 2004, 440 with fn. 47; Pinault, 2008, 189). Having a synchronically irregular full vowel, the forms then must have been reminiscent of *s*-preterits and consequently could take on the genuine *s*-preterit ending *-ar*.[26]

7.2.2. Pt Class I < Pt Class III

A different case is the *ā*-preterit of [A]*eṃts[(a)]*- 'seize' showing 1.sg.mid. TA *eṃtse*, 2.sg.mid. TA *entsāte*, 3.sg.mid. TA *eṃtsāt*, and 3.pl.mid. TA *entsānt*, which has to be analyzed as Class I preterit "vom toch. Standpunkt aus", as per TEB I, 244, § 438,3, Anm., because of the related Sub V. Etymologically, we are clearly dealing with the *s*-preterit attested for this root in Tocharian B, which explains immediately why no weakening of *-ā*- via vowel balance occurs. Such an irregular preservation of *-ā*- is also met in all non-finite forms derived from the respective Sub V stem, and found once in the 1.sg. TA *e(ṃ)tsāmār*,[27] next to regularly syncopated 1.sg. TA *eṃtsmār*. Since the original Pt III inflected as medium tantum, such a shift could take place here most easily. On the other hand, 3.sg. active forms of Pt III (ending in PT (*)-*sā*) could also be reanalyzed as Pt I forms leading finally to forms such as 1.sg. *wsāwa* from *wä(s)[?]*- 'give', 1.sg. TA *wsā*, 2.sg. TA *wsāṣt* from [A]*wä(s)[?]*- 'id.', PPt *tatāsaṣ* from *tās*- 'put', PPt TA *tātwsu* from [A]*twā*-/[A]*twās[(a)]*- 'burn', and 3.sg. *swāsa* from *suw[ā]*- 'rain'; see above and Peters, 2006, 336, fn. 17.

7.2.3. Pt II acquiring Pt I inflection in Tocharian A

A preterit of Class II from a root of the structure TA *wäCC*- may show *ā*-preterit inflection due to early contraction of *wV-wV-, cf. Krause,

---

[26] Pace Peyrot, 2008, 133f., I do not think that *prautkar* is simply the regular ("causative") *s*-preterit of that root, because, as he correctly states, the causative paradigm of this root is made of the *sk*-stem type (i.e., a Kausativum I in my terminology). Although an *s*-preterit cannot a priori be excluded (and would, in my terminology belong to an Antigrundverb of that root), the explanation given above fits both the diachronic aspect and the eastern/informal-style like appearance of the forms in question.

[27] A 404 b 5 (TG, 425 "im Verse"). Although there is not much left of the fragment, a verbal form of that kind standing sentence-finally is highly plausible: //// *e(ṃ)tsāmār : 3* | |.

1955a, 138; TEB I, 246f., § 441,2; Winter, 1965a, 207f. = 1984, 174f. = 2005, 132f., fn. 1), and see chap. Pt II 8.1.3.1.

7.3.   DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

7.3.1. *General remarks*

Since there exist seven subclasses of the non-*yā*-type Pt I all of which differ from each other with respect to root ablaut, it is a reasonable assumption that the non-*yā*-type Pt I complex viewed as a whole did not have just one single PIE origin, but rather several different sources.

Since participles tend to be more conservative than their respective indicative paradigms, the evidence provided by the PPts has to play a major role in the analysis of the origin of these subclasses.

As will be shown in greater detail in chap. PPt, Jasanoff is right in claiming (1992, 151, fn. 25; 1994, 201, fn. 6; also apud Þórhallsdóttir, 1988, 206, fn. 7, and apud Ringe, 1991, 95) that the PPt type in *-ow(ä/o) > -au, -oṣ(ä/o)*, which is the one regularly attested type beside the Subclasses 1 through 4 and 6 of Pt I, must go back to pre-PT *-āu̯ōs, *-āu̯os-.[28] Accordingly, at least some members of Subclasses 1 through 4 and 6 must derive from stems that rather invariably ended in pre-PT *-ā-, i.e., PIE *-ah₂[(e)h₁].

On the other hand, the PPt type in *-au, -aṣ*, which is the one that is regularly associated with Subclass 5, clearly goes back to pre-PT *-a/ōu̯ōs, *-a/ōu̯os-.

Finally, at least the PPt that belonged to the Subclass 7 Pt I *lyakāwa*, i.e., *lyelyku* from pre-PT *le-leg-ä-wōs, must have lacked the stem-final PT *-ā- that we meet so constantly in the indicative of the same verb.

---

[28] I fail to understand how pre-PT *-ā- could have been introduced here analogically, as hesitantly proposed by Ringe, 1991, 95. Note that a strategy quite similar to Jasanoff's is used by Klingenschmitt, 1975, 159 = 2005, 143 with respect to the TB optatives and imperfects in *-oy(-)*, which he (correctly, I think) derives from a PT "*-ą̊i̯*" that presupposes the existence of 3.sg.act. forms in PT *-ą̊ from pre-PT *-āt.

7.3.2. *The relationship between Subclasses 1/2 and 4/3*

There can be no doubt that the ablaut schemes *(')ä/æ/ä met with in Subclasses 3 and 4 of Tocharian A were older than the schemes *(')ä/(')ä/ä met with in Subclasses 1 and 2 of Tocharian B, and that the latter derived from the former. On the one hand, any more complex pattern clearly constitutes kind of a *lectio difficilior*, and on the other hand, there even exist several relic forms in Tocharian B which prove that Tocharian B also once had inflected along the schemes of Subclasses 3 and 4.

This said, I hasten to add that for obvious reasons I do not see how the more archaic PT paradigms with ablaut schemes *(')ä/æ/ä could be derived in a meaningful way from one single PIE verbal category suspected to have had an *o*-grade in some part of its paradigm. On the one hand, we do not know of any PIE verbal paradigms with *e/o*- or *ø/o*- ablaut, and furthermore none of the PIE verbal paradigms we think have shown *o/e*- or *o/ø*- ablaut would have been likely to turn into a Subclass 3- or Subclass 4-like paradigm on their own and without some massive pressure from outside the original paradigm. Therefore, I think it best to assume that PT *æ here had replaced a pre-PT *ä secondarily for one reason or another. According to Jasanoff, 1984, 57 (followed by Pinault, 1989, 147f.) we may be dealing here simply with a "reverse analogy" (based on an inherited *o/ø* alternation in the Sub Class V). In contrast, Peters, 2004, 440ff. proposed "einen urtocharischen Lautwandel von vortonigem *-*ä*- zu *-*æ*- in maximaler Akzentferne".[29] His other examples in favor of such a sound law — not all of them really compelling — will be discussed in the appropriate places. The proposal by Klingenschmitt 1994, 406, fn. 164 = 2005, 431, fn. 164 (see also Adams, 1988a, 91: "an importation, somehow, from the perfect") to account for the presence of the *æ in the active plural and the dual by assuming a merger with a perfect (or perfect-like) paradigm is evaluated at the end of the following paragraph.

---

[29] See also his critique of an earlier similar analysis by Schmidt, 1985a, 764f. Similarly, Winter, 1981, 130 and 1992, 99 assumed PIE *e > PT *æ in monosyllables, but see the objections by Kim, 2001, 123f. and the more recent quite different explanation of *śem* 'came' by Winter himself (Winter, 1999, 261f.).

7.3.3. *Subclasses 1 and 4 (with palatalized root initial)*

As soon as one agrees to reconstruct for Subclasses 1 and 4 a pre-PT root ablaut *e (sg. active) / *ä ([at least in the] 3.pl. active, dual, whole middle), one feels, of course, reminded of the ablaut pattern typical of athematic non-Narten root aorist indicatives/injunctives (and also non-Narten imperfects). Since, stem-final PT *-ā- can be the result of a laryngeal in the context C_C, it is then a rather trivial guess that Subclasses 1 and 4, the members of which have quite often a fully inflected paradigm consisting of both active and middle forms, derive indeed from non-Narten root aorist indicatives built from roots ending in a laryngeal; see for such an analysis,[30] e.g., Pedersen, 1941, 185; Lane, 1959, 173f.; Adams, 1978, 284; Schmidt, 1982, 369; Jasanoff, 1984, 57ff.; Ringe, 1991, 95; Klingenschmitt, 1994, 407 = 2005, 432, fn. 165; Schmidt, 1997a, 255ff.; Peters, 2004, 440; Kim, 2009, 14ff.

A different view is taken by Winter, 1980b, 552ff. = 1984, 245ff. = 2005, 239ff., who does not believe that the palatalization needs to be explained by the former presence of a PIE *e. According to him, palatalization may be just a consequence of transitivity, i.e., he claims that root-initial palatalization was just a synchronic marker of transitivity. According to his own observations, *ā*-preterits from A-character roots with non-full root vowel (*ä, i, u*) that show root-initial palatalization (i.e., from a Subclass 1 or 4 or 6 Pt I) are always associated with nasal presents (usually Prs VI, rarely Prs VII), and, moreover, are always transitive, whereas those definitely lacking palatalization (i.e., a Subclass 2 or 3 Pt I) are intransitive and form a present of Class III. If one takes a closer look at the material, however, things do not look so simple any more: the pattern Winter thinks he has found is indeed predominant but not exclusive, because there are many exceptions in both directions, i.e., intransitive forms in Subclasses 1 and 4 (note especially the very frequent *stäm(ä)*-/ *Aṣtäm(ä)*- 'stand' and *ABläm(ä)*- 'sit'), transitive forms in Subclasses 2 and 3, and present stem formations other than claimed by Winter for both types, see the lists above. Therefore, one has to conclude that there simply does not exist a synchronic rule by which palatalization implies, and gets automatically triggered by, transitivity. To be sure, there is a synchronic pattern with respect to root-initial palatalization in *ā*-preterits, but the correlation is with the respective subjunctives rather than with the cognate present stems (pace Kim, 2009, 24), and this

---

[30] For *ñätkatai* with palatalization also in the middle see below the discussion of Subclass 7.

pattern has diachronic reasons, and no implications for semantic-syntax.

As a matter of fact, a comparison of $\bar{a}$-preterits and corresponding $\bar{a}$-subjunctives leads to the following picture: all roots forming a Subclass 1 or a Subclass 4 $\bar{a}$-preterit, i.e., showing palatalizing -$\ddot{a}$- in the singular active, have a corresponding $\bar{a}$-subjunctive that has active inflection, ablaut, and initial accent in Tocharian B (if diagnostic forms are attested at all). At least there are no counterexamples.[31] The cases are:

kät^a- 'strew', *kätk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*kätk$^{(a)}$*- 'cross, pass', *kärs$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*kärs$^{(a)}$*- 'know', *käl^a*-/ ^{A}*käl^a*- 'lead, bring', *klänts$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*klis^a*- 'sleep', *tärk^a*-/ ^{A}*tärk^a*- 'dismiss, emit', *läm$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*läm$^{(a)}$*- 'sit', *stäm$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*ṣtäm$^{(a)}$*- 'stand'.

kätk$^{(a)}$- and *kärs$^{(a)}$*- have a mixed accent pattern, *tsuk^a*- and *lu^a*- 'send' are unclear with respect to accent, but *tsuk^a*- shows -$\bar{a}$- in the active singular Sub V.

On the other hand, those roots having a Subclass 2 or 3 preterit with non-palatalizing -$\ddot{a}$- in their great majority have corresponding TB $\bar{a}$-subjunctives which are media tantum and lack both initial accent and ablaut. The only noticeable exception is *kärst^a*- 'cut off' forming an ablauting Sub V with initial accent (full-grade 3.sg.act. *krāstaṃ*, cf. Ipv I 2.sg. *pkrāsta*) although the $\bar{a}$-preterit lacks root-initial pala-talization.[32]

The pairing of transitive Subclass 1, and respectively Subclass 4 $\bar{a}$-preterits with nasal presents as addressed by Winter, l.c., is certainly an inherited pattern, cf. Schmidt, 1982, 368f.; 1989a, 305; and Pinault, 1989, 148 who quotes as an example PIE *√kelh₁ → *käl^a*- 'lead, bring': root aorist *kelh₁-/*kl̥h₁- → *śäl-ā-/*käl-ā-, present *kl̥-n-h₁- > *kälnā-; another case in point is *kät^a*- 'strew' from PIE *√(s)kedh₂ 'split'. As for the corresponding $\bar{a}$-subjunctives, see chap. Sub I/V 18.4.1. That transitive active (root) aorists stood regularly beside transitive active nasal presents in Vedic, Greek, and probably PIE is actually acknowledged by Winter himself (1980, 441 = 2005, 223): "the use of

---

[31] *lip^a*- has to be explained otherwise, see below s.v. the diachronic explanation of Subclass 6.

[32] *lit$^{(a)}$*- is a special case, because it shows a zero-grade $\bar{a}$-preterit stem *lit-ā*- in both Tocharian A and B, and *lit*- is also still attested in the PPt of TB and in Sub V form variants of TA: *litālune/letlune* beside an apparently secondary full-vowel $\bar{a}$-subjunctive **læyt-ā-* (TB Sub V only has a stem *laitā*-, in the TA Sub V both stem formations are attested; TB has both stems in the PPt, whereas TA only has the stem **læyt-ā-* as basis of the PPt, while it shows the zero-grade stem in the finite preterit).

-*n*- in the present tense of Tocharian transitive verbs can be traced back to Common Indo-European times".

As for the prevalence of transitivity, in PIE all active forms of (athematic) root aorists were transitive with the exception of the active forms from unergative roots, and even these tended to be replaced by middle forms in the various branches, see, e.g., the telling example of PIE *√mer 'die' as discussed in Barton, 1989, 135ff.

That said, it must be stressed that there are still many loose ends left. On the one hand, how is it that such root aorists had participles in PT *-å̄wæṣ- rather than PT *-āwæṣ-? On the other hand, it has already been noticed by various scholars since Pedersen, 1941, 185f. that not too many members of Subclasses 1 and 4 are likely candidates to be indeed traced back to PIE non-Narten root aorists from seṭ roots. In this category, I would include only *kät^a*- 'strew', *käl^a*- 'lead, bring', *tär$^{a?}$*- '± stretch', *läm$^{(a)}$*- 'sit' (if to be connected with Gk νωλεμής 'restless'), *lu^a*- 'send', and *wät$^{a?}$*- 'fight' (cf. Vedic *ávadhīt*). As for *stäm$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*ṣtäm$^{(a)}$*- 'stand', the equation with Vedic *ástambhīt* 'hat gestützt' (as advocated, e.g., by Ringe, 1991, 94 and Schmidt, 1997a, 255ff.) does not semantically fit at all.[33]

pärk^a- '(a)rise' is an especially tricky case. The Vedic and the Armenian evidence may speak in favor of the reconstruction of a seṭ root, and both these two branches and in addition Anatolian and Celtic suggest we are dealing with a PIE unaccusative root with non-durative semantics, but then the 3.sg. active root aorist of such a root *bʰerĝʰ(H)-t ought to have had transitive semantics also in Tocharian. For this reason, Klingenschmitt, 1982, 108f. claimed on the basis of what he thought was the Tocharian evidence alone that the root had been rather an unergative one in PIE, i.e., one that had an intransitive active root aorist. As a matter of fact, if there was not the abstract °*pirko* with an -*i*-, there would have been every reason to assign 2.sg. *pärkasta*, 3.sg. *parka* to Subclass 2 (which consists of zero-grade formations in pre-PT *-ā-).[34]

As for the rest of the members of subclasses 1 and 4, Pedersen, 1941, 186 and maybe also Klingenschmitt, 1982, 108 assumed a systematic transfer of PIE non-Narten root aorists built from aniṭ roots

---

[33] On the other hand, a prehistoric Tocharian cognate of Vedic *ástambhīt* seems to be presupposed by both *śanmau* 'fetter, bond' (see Malzahn, 2005, 396) and Pt II *śānmya* from *ś(c)änm*- 'bind' (see Peters, 2006, 341, fn. 32).

[34] Note that Winter, 1990b, 2536 = 2005, 416 toyed with the idea that this Pt I was of denominative origin, but only to reject it in the end.

to Subclasses 1 and 4 of Tocharian Pt I; but Pedersen's own list has to be called rather outdated from today's point of view, and the only examples Klingenschmitt could come up with are precisely *parka* and *marsa*/ TA *märs* 'forgot', both of which may have rather been zero-grade formations in PT *-å̄-, i.e., have belonged to Subclasses 2 and 3. On the other hand, Hackstein, 1995, 36 suggested a "gelegentlichen Übertritt ererbter Aniṭ-Wurzeln" to the class of Tocharian roots with A-character, but did not name any conditioning factors. Finally, Jasanoff, 1984, 54ff. claimed the existence of a special previously unnoticed PIE aorist suffix *-h_2-, in order to explain the obvious existence of PIE aorist stems ending in *-s/TH-, reflexes of which he thinks are met not only in the Subclasses 1 and 4 of Tocharian Pt I, but in Indo-Iranian as well, and which according to Jasanoff, 1984, can hardly be explained by setting up roots ending in an obstruent plus a laryngeal. Jasanoff's reconstruction of a PIE aorist marker *-h_2- has not met with general acceptance, however, see, e.g., Oettinger, 1984, 190ff.; Ringe, 1991, 91ff., and was finally withdrawn by Jasanoff himself in Jasanoff, 1994, 201, fn. 6.

But even if one were willing to take the existence of this h_2-aorist formant for granted, this would help only for Subclass 1/4 preterits such as *śarsa*, *carka*, *pirsāre*, *palyka*, *lyukā-me*, and TA *śuk*, where (*)-*ā*- seems to follow a bare root, but not for *piñña*, *śatka*, *śutkām*, nor for Subclass 6 Pt I *ñätka*, *ñätkatai*, where (*)-*ā*- follows the present-stem suffixes pre-PT *-u̯- and *-sk-.

Accordingly, it seems quite appropriate to look for yet other solutions.

As for *śarsa*, *carka*, *pirsāre*, *palyka*, *lyukā-me*, TA *śuk*, and also *śama*/ TA *śäm*, I propose to regard these formations as representatives of a Narten variant of the primary zero-grade aorist type in pre-PT *-ā- that must have provided the core members of Subclasses 2 and 3[35] (see immediately below). If this is correct, at least the zero grade of the root that is met in the middle forms of these paradigms would have to have been introduced analogically, under the influence of the non-Narten root aorists that constitute the core material of Subclasses 1 and 4. Such an explanation could nicely account for the intransitive use of *lyukā-me*, and as we will see, such a view might also enable us to explain how the (Late) pre-PT preterit

---

[35] Cf. Gk ἐτέρση and Doric Gk *egénā (Peters, 2002, 113, fn. 32), both members of obviously related Greek morphological categories (see below) that in general require the zero grade of a root.

3.sg. act. *kērsā/a could denote both 'knew' and 'made know(n)', and that the same also holds even for the Pt I middle stem allomorph PT *kärsā-. There is plenty of inner-Tocharian evidence indicating Narten behavior at least for some of these roots, cf. the TA imperfect *śārsar* 'they knew' (most probably = TB Pt II *śārsare-ne* 'they made know(n)'), the TB Pt III *pelykwa* 'burnt', the TB Pt III antigrundverb *lyauksa*, *lyaukar* 'illuminated', and the TB Pt I Subclass 7 *ṣṭamāwa* 'placed'.

As for the already mentioned forms in (*)-*tkā*-, which derive from pre-PT *-T-skā- (see chap. *tk*-Roots), I suggest that they may be denominatives from *e*-grade abstracts in PIE *-sk̂eh$_2$- (on the existence of such abstracts in *-sk̂eh$_2$- beside present stems in *-sk̂-e/o-, see Melchert, 1977, 100 and Peters, 2006, 341f., fn. 34). As is to be gleaned from the views of Karl Hoffmann as reported apud Lühr, 1984, 41ff., aorists belonging to denominative presents (in PIE *-i̯e/o-) were/could be provided by a phrase consisting of the instr.sg. of the noun that was basic to the respective denominative present on the one hand and a form of an auxiliary verb on the other hand. Further, as suggested by Jasanoff, 1978, 122ff., these respective forms of the auxiliary verb could be simply left out, and the instr.sg. form thus turn into a 3.sg. active form and thereby act as a basis for a fully inflected paradigm, i.e., *śatka* etc. may precisely go back to PIE *-sk̂eh$_2$(e)h$_1$(t) > (Early) pre-PT *-skāt.[36] Note in this context that the TB Subclass 5 preterit *kawāte-ne* with the PPt *kakāpau* obviously forms one synchronic paradigm with the clearly denominative Prs XII *kawaññentär* 'desire' made from *kāwo* 'desire', and therefore is to be taken descriptively as a form of a denominative paradigm. Any kind of root ablaut found in these paradigms then would again have to be introduced secondarily, and non-ablauting *ñätk*- then may have simply preserved the original state of affairs. As for *piñña*, one may speculate that an Early pre-PT aorist *penu̯āt had been built from a present stem pre-PT *penu- or *penu̯-e/o- on models such as mentioned in Peters, 2006, 341f., fn. 34. If part of the members of Subclasses 1 and 4 had started out as stems in pre-PT *-ā- and not pre-PT *-a- or *-ō-, and therefore had PPts in

---

[36] According to Peters, forthc., many Hittite presents (e.g., *nekuzzi*), especially a large number of members of the Hittite *ḫi*-conjugation (such as *wastāi*), were built via what I call the *tēzzi* principle from denominative aorists that themselves had started out from instrumental forms of both the thematic and athematic basic nouns in *-oh$_1$ or *-eh$_1$, and according to Peters instrumentals in *-eh$_1$ also formed the basis for what seem to be denominative Greek aorists with a zero morpheme such as Homeric ἔχραισμε.

pre-PT *-āu̯os- > PT *-å̄wæṣ- and not in pre-PT *-a/ōu̯os- > *-āwæṣ-, this fact may have greatly helped in establishing the later synchronic rule that Pt I with a root vowel PT *(')ä were to form PPt in PT *-å̄wæṣ-, and Pt I with a root vowel PT *ā were to form PPt in PT *-āwæṣ-.

As for the strange PT root vowel *æ that we meet in the active plural and dual forms of Subclasses 1 through 4 (regularly in TA, and sporadically in TB), this may be explained due to the influence of *o*-grade forms of competing perfects (that would most probably otherwise be continued by related Sub V paradigms), as has been suggested by Klingenschmitt, 1994, 406 = 2005, 431, fn. 164.

With respect to such an explanation, I think the most reasonable scenario would be the following one: (1) Tocharian inherited a certain number of seṭ roots, both active root aorists and active perfects; (2) the perfects turned into preterits with the same meaning the respective root aorists had had right from the start, and borrowed from the latter the root-final pre-PT *a from PIE *H which should have mostly left no traces in the original perfect paradigm in the case of a lautgesetzlich development, both because of Saussure's Law and because of PIE *CR̥HC > pre-PT *CäRC; (3) at a time when the former perfects now acting as preterits had still pre-PT *o/ä-ablaut, on their basis new presents were formed by the *tēzzi* principle, viz. presents which had precisely such a pre-PT *o/ä-ablaut and which were meant to turn later into Sub V; (4) afterwards, the root aorists and the former perfects, which now had more or less the same meaning as the related root aorists, still continued to exist side by side, and the former perfects finally generalized the pre-PT *o-vowel through the whole active paradigm; (5) finally, the root aorists borrowed the pre-PT *o-vowel from the competing former perfects that now lacked ablaut in the active; but only in the plural and dual of the active, and not in the singular active; more or less immediately afterwards, the competing former perfect paradigms were lost.

To be honest, I do not think that anyone would like to predict, or find plausible, all parts of assumed stages of development (4) and (5).[37] What is worse, the TA 3.pl. act. forms TA *prasar* and TA *mrasar*

---

[37] I find even the second part of stage of development (2) quite unlikely, for reasons also discussed in the final paragraph in chap. Sub I/V, i.e., because of the obvious behavior of the root *mit*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'set out', which evidently goes back to a PIE seṭ root, *√mei̯th₂, and I guess had preserved both a PIE (probably active) root aorist (still reflected in the Sub V) and indeed a PIE active perfect until late; the only historically preserved Pt from this root is actually a Pt III

(probably TA *krasar*) show descriptively schwebeablaut (also met in TA Sub V *krasaṣ*, but not in the TB equivalent Sub V *kārsau*), so a scholar like Klingenschmitt would have to claim in addition either that the respective perfects had in their paradigms an inherited kind of schwebeablaut, for which I do not see any other evidence elsewhere, or that there had occurred a special inner-Tocharian, i.e., pre-PT metathesis *Cor/ls- > *Cr/los-, which would also be rather arbitrary a strategy.[38] Accordingly, I think that the kind of explanation adduced by Klingenschmitt can hardly be correct. On the other hand, note that if Peters, 2004, 443 is right in explaining *kras-*, etc. in the 3.pl. forms of Pt I rather as lautgesetzlich phonological results of a PT *krās-, etc. from an intermediate PT *kr̥₂s-, etc., which according to him would have been a more or less regular result of a pre-PT *kärs-, etc. "in maximaler Akzentferne", then TA Sub V *krasaṣ* and TB Sub V *krāstäṃ*, *klātsāt*, and *plāskau* would seem to suggest that the Sub V active sg. forms with root vowel PT *æ were no archaic phenomenon, i.e., no offshoots of the *tēzzi* principle of (otherwise not directly attested) perfects from seṭ roots, but rather secondarily built on the model of the Sub I paradigms with inherited *o/zero* ablaut, and having as their starting point precisely zero-grade root allomorphs such as *krās-* < *kr̥₂s- and *plāsk-* < *pl̥₂sk-.

7.3.4. *Subclasses 2 and 3 (with non-palatalized root initial)*

As already indicated above, the members of these classes have, or at least must have had originally, a non-palatalizing (*)ä as their root vowel throughout the whole paradigm. They are mostly intransitive, and despite being usually activa tantum themselves, they have in Tocharian B mostly middle-only subjunctives (of Class V), and in both branches middle-only presents (of Class III) next to them.[39] Their PPts

---

(attested in both branches), so that one must conclude that in the paradigm of this verb, root-final pre-PT *-a- (although formerly surfacing in the aorist) was precisely *not* analogically introduced into the old perfect stem. The same may also hold for some other Tocharian roots from PIE seṭ roots, such as *ār⁽ᵃ⁾-*/ ᴬ*ār⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cease, etc.' and *näm-*/ ᴬ*näm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'bend, bow'.

[38] Actually, a schwebeablaut of the same kind is also met in the TB Sub V forms *krāstäṃ*, *klātsāt*, and *plāskau* that belong to the roots *kärst^ä-* 'cut off, destroy', *käl(t)s^ä-* '(op)press', and *pälsk^ä-* 'consider, think', which hardly could have had PIE perfects such as †ke-kros-t-e and †bʰe-bʰlog-sk̂-e.

[39] The structural correspondence between Pt I of this subclass and Prs III is also correctly emphasized by Kim, 2009, 17ff. However, since I have different

in PT *-ǻwǣṣ- from pre-PT *-āu̯os- must have belonged to, and spread from, the core members of these very two classes, which implies, of course, that we have to do here essentially with stems that ended in a (probably [almost] invariant) pre-PT *ā, and not in a pre-PT *a or *ō.

The fact that we nevertheless find only PT *ā > TA/TB (*)ā as stem-final vowel throughout the whole indicative paradigm can be most easily accounted for. On the one hand, in the 3.pl. act. the ending may have been pre-PT *-ant → *-aro rather than pre-PT *-ānt → *-āro right from the start, and for the same reasons we find -εν rather than -ην as a 3.pl. ending of the aorists in -η within most of archaic Ancient Greek. On the other hand, pace Ringe, 1991, 95, it is quite probable that an Early pre-PT 3.sg. act. ending *-āt that lost the final *-t rather sooner than later would have developed by sound law into Late pre-PT *-a rather than *-ā, to judge from the fact that the PIE acc.sg. of the fem. of the deictic pronoun *to-, i.e., *tām, evidently underwent an irregularly early loss of word-final *-m in pre-PT, and as a consequence emerged in fact as tā, TA tāṣ, and not as TB *to, TA *taṣ, thereby pointing to a development pre-PT *tām > *tā > *ta > PT *tā. Given the fact that at the same time the root aorists of Subclasses 1 and 4, and most of the denominatives met in Subclass 5, had a stem-final vowel other than pre-PT *-ā-, and precisely one that had to result in PT *-ā- (i.e., pre-PT *-a- and pre-PT *-ō- respectively) throughout their indicative paradigm right from the start, it really should not come as a surprise if in the marked 1. and 2. person forms an original PT *ǻ < pre-PT *ā was analogically completely ousted by the PT *ā < pre-PT *a of the unmarked 3. person forms.[40]

As for the members of Subclasses 2 and 3 that are evidently primary formations and both intransitive and inflecting as activa tantum, a perfect match then seems to be provided both formally and functionally by those Doric aorists ending in suffixal -ā- that at the same time have the same zero-grade morphology, the same function, and the same semantics as the aorists with a bare suffix -ē- that are met in the other Ancient Greek dialects and also, beside those in -ā-, in Doric itself (see for such an equation Peters, 1997, 215, fn. 40; 2006, 341, fn. 34). However, these Doric aorists are evidently cognates of Balto-

---

views on the prehistory of Prs III (see chap. Prs III/IV), I cannot follow his explanation of this Pt I subclass as simply analogically created ā-preterits based on the respective Prs III forms.

[40] See already Jasanoff, 1992, 151 fn. 25 ("replacement of *-ǻ- by the productive preterite marker *-ā-"), and Peters, 1997, 215, fn. 40.

Slavic zero-grade preterits ending in suffixal pre-Balto-Slavic (circumflexed) *-ā-, and those Balto-Slavic preterits in *-ā-, and also the Balto-Slavic zero-grade cognates of the respective Greek aorists in -ē-, are not at all restricted to intransitive valency (see, e.g., Stang, 1966, 388).[41] Moreover, as will become evident in the discussion of Subclass 7, suffixal pre-PT *-ā- had not even been confined to intransitive valency at an earlier stage of Tocharian language prehistory itself. In sum, I think it is fair to say that after all Lévi/Meillet, 1914, 3; Lane, 1959, 170ff.; 1962, 62ff.; 1970, 78f., and Jasanoff, 1984, 66ff. were right in comparing the Pt I with the Lithuanian preterits of the *bùvo* type and related material.[42]

To judge from Baltic and Slavic, the original semantics of the ā- and ē-aorists must have allowed them to replace both transitive and intransitive (root) aorists; and according to Jasanoff, 1978 at least the ē- aorists, and according to Peters, 1997, 211, fn. 12, both types had started out as instrumental forms of verbal abstracts. In Greek itself, *(e)u̯idē (as per Peters, 1997; 2007, 267 fn. 26) and ἐδάη, and according to Allan, 2003, 159f. even an ἐδράκη to be inferred from Pindaric δρακέντ- (but see Forssman, 1964, 17ff.), acted as transitives, and

---

[41] And furthermore Jasanoff, 1984, 62ff.; Peters, 1997, 210f.; Villanueva Svensson, 2005, 239ff. with ref. Note also that judging from Rix, 1998, Proto-Italic must once have had the same kind of both transitive and intransitive zero-grade active aorist ending in suffixal "PIE" *-ā- that is found in Doric and Balto-Slavic, as already claimed by scholars such as Brugmann, Pedersen, and Lane; see, most recently, Lane, 1970, 78 with ref.

[42] See also the discussions in VW II/2, 118f.; G. Schmidt, 1985, 65ff.; Thomas, 1985a, 80; Adams, 1988a, 90; Ringe, 1991, 95 ("fairly good evidence for the *ā-aorist as a shared BS-Tocharian innovation"); Peters, 2004, 440. For an etymological analysis of that "PIE" *-ā-suffix, see Jasanoff, 1984, 64ff.; 1992, 142 (given the fact that this author has since changed his views about the origins of Tocharian Prs III and IV and explicitly abandoned his idea of an aorist marker *-h₂- in Jasanoff, 1994, 201, fn. 6, he probably would not subscribe to his view on the aorists in "PIE" *-ā- of 1984 and 1992 any longer); Adams, 1988a, 90; Peters, 1997, 211, fn. 12; and Hackstein, 2002a, 266ff. (Baltic *-ā- from root-final *-h₂ + -eh₁, Slavic -a- in addition also from root-final *-h₃ + *-eh₁, no such suffix in either Greek or Tocharian; Hackstein does not address Doric *egenā [for which see Peters, 2002, 113, fn. 32] nor the circumflex intonation of the Baltic suffix; apart from reference to Ringe, 1991, 91ff., for Tocharian one has to add Jasanoff's argument regarding the PPt in -ow, -oṣ that is quite favorably discussed there). Recently, also Pinault, 2008, 598 adopted the theory that the non-alternating Pt I forms with root vowels ä, i, u in fact go back to PIE preterits in suffixal *-eh₂-.

*sruu̯ē/ā- as an aorist to an intransitive active present (ῥέω); but in general, the Greek *ē*- and *ā*-aorists ended up specializing in replacing intransitive middle aorist forms.[43] The very same, it seems, finally happened to the equivalent primary *ā*-aorists in Tocharian, as can be seen, e.g., from the list of middle forms and active Pt I forms (from Subclasses 1-4) that both act as oppositional intransitives to active transitive forms of Pt III (see Ringe, 1990, 189) — cf. especially TA Pt 0 *lyokät* and TB Pt III *lauksāte* (MQ) and *lyuksamnte* standing beside TB Pt I (Subclass 1) *lyukā-me* and TA Pt 0 *wākät* beside TA Pt I (Subclass 5) *wāk*.[44] Within such a framework, the TB intransitive middle-only Sub V forms belonging to intransitive active-only Pt I forms of Subclasses 2 and 3 (= PT *wäykātär type) then can easily be explained as blends of two different kinds of *tēzzi*-type formations: (1) very archaic intransitive middle presents (> subjunctives) derived via the *tēzzi* principle from very archaic, mostly prehistoric, intransitive middle root aorists that tended to be replaced, or actually have been ousted completely by the respective active Pt I formations;[45] (2) maybe at least sometimes less archaic active presents (> subjunctives) derived via the *tēzzi* principle from the active Pt I formations that finally replaced the respective intransitive middle root aorists.[46] Note, however, that at the time the *tēzzi* principle was a productive device, the *ā*-preterits of Subclasses 2 and 3 may still have had both

---

[43] Cf. Jasanoff, 2004, 163f.: "The oldest η-aorists in Greek seem to have been the replacements of middle root aorists."

[44] The assertions by Lane (1959, 173f.) and Adams that in my Subclasses 2 and 3 we are dealing with "refashioned thematic aorists" (Adams, 1988a, 90) will then be correct if, and only if, one substitutes "mostly intransitive athematic aorists with Middle II endings such as 3.sg. *-e of the ἔτραφε type" for "thematic aorists".

[45] It has to be pointed out that such an old middle root aorist cannot be reconstructed meaningfully for each and every of the middle-only Sub V formations: the roots *prutk⁽ᵃ⁾-*, *mätsts^a-*, *musk⁽ᵃ⁾-*, *mlutk^a-*, *ritt⁽ᵃ⁾-*, and *sätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* clearly must have started out as denominative (aorist) stems and therefore could not have formed old middle root aorists, but quite obviously we are dealing here with a mildly productive pattern of (pre-)TB.

[46] According to Jasanoff, 2003, 164, the middle inflection of these subjunctives in TB was nothing old and should be explained as an innovation triggered by "the influence of the corresponding deponent presents" of Prs Class III; however, in that case one should expect the active-only Sub V forms attested beside deponent presents of Class IV to have adopted middle inflection in TB as well, which was not the case. Therefore, the TB state of affairs should be viewed as *lectio difficilior*, i.e., is the more archaic one.

transitive/causative and intransitive/anticausative semantics at the same time, much as is the case with Sub V = Prs V *iyaṃ* 'go, travel; lead, cause to go' even in historical times.

One may be led to think that within such a framework, also the middle-only character of the paradigmatically related Class III presents could easily be explained, but see the respective chapter.[47]

Finally, it has to be stressed that many members of Subclasses 2 and 3 are obviously of a quite different origin: e.g., *käryā-* 'buy, trade' derives together with Gk ἐπρίατο from a PIE medium tantum non-Narten aorist PIE *k^urih$_2$-to, *k^urih$_2$-ento > pre-PT and Proto-Greek *k^urii̯anto, with a stem *k^urii̯a- finally abstracted in both pre-PT and Proto-Greek from the 3.pl.; on the other hand, *wä(s)²-* 'give' and *mä(s)²-* 'go' most likely started out as members of Pt III. However, the majority of the members of Subclasses 2 and 3 that are more or less clearly non-primary formations seem to be denominatives, and will probably mostly derive from nominal *eh$_2$*-stems, i.e., the Pt I from *kärst^a-* 'cut off' (which actually forms an active Sub V in TB), all relevant formations from roots in *-sk^a-* and *-tk^a-*, and finally the Pt I from *räss$^{(a)}$-* 'tear' and *ritt$^{(a)}$-* 'be attached to', which derive from stems ending in PT *-swā-, *-twā-.

7.3.5. *Subclass 5*

The main characteristics of Subclass 5 are the persistent non-palatalizing root vowel (*)ā, which can derive from pre-PT *a > PT *ā, pre-PT *ō > PT *ā, and pre-PT *o > PT *æ (via *ā*-umlaut), and the related PPt that end consistently in PT *-āwæṣ-, and not in PT *-åwæṣ-. With respect to valency, there is no obvious preference for transitivity or intransitivity in this subclass; with respect to voice, we find activa tantum, media tantum, and also verbs used in both the active and the middle voice.

---

[47] On the other hand, Barton's suggestion to compare the rather marginal, and rarely attested PIE scheme of intransitive active root aorists standing beside intransitive middle presents (Barton, 1989, 141) leads nowhere; Subclasses 2 and 3 definitely do not go back to active root aorists of PIE. The same must be said of the manifest strategy by Schmidt (1974, 29ff.; 1997c, 567f.) and Winter, 1994a, 293f. = 2005, 474f. to derive all Pt I that go together with a Class III or Class IV present from intransitive active perfects of PIE, which with respect to morphology is especially implausible for the members of Subclasses 2 and 3.

According to Adams, 1978, 282 and 1988a, 85, the PIE perfect with root vowel pre-PT *o resulted in three different kinds of Tocharian preterits, namely Pt 0, Pt III, and also the TB *paiyka*-type variant of Pt I (however, Adams did not want to explain all members of my Subclass 5 that way, see Adams, 1988a, 91, where we read: "Aorists very similar to our subgroup 1 [equivalent to my Subclasses 2 and 3, M.M.] form Krause and Thomas' preterite Class Ib [equivalent to my Subclass 5, M.M.]", and *wāk^a̦*- is given as example). Quite similarly, Winter, 1962a, 32f. = 1984, 274f. = 2005, 62f. derived *wāya* from a PIE *o*-grade perfect form "*EwodAe*". Klingenschmitt, 1994, 314 = 2005, 356, fn. 6 is again explicit just about *paiyka*; according to him, we are dealing here with an "$\bar{o}$-Perfekt; Ausgangspunkt etwa ... *h_1e-$h_1oi̦$- > *$\bar{o}i̦$-", whereas it is from PIE $\bar{o}$-grade perfects rather that Van Windekens (VW II/2, 133f.) wants to derive the type *paiyka*. On the other hand, Schmidt, 1997c, 557ff. claims that "die zunächst ganz isoliert stehenden Bildungen vom Typus *klāwa* [which is actually an intransitive and means 'be called, named' M.M.]" are cognates of the Indo-Iranian 3.sg. passive aorist forms of the Vedic *śrāvi* type (see also Jasanoff, 1992, 151f., fn. 34), and that both TB *klāwa* on the one hand, and Vedic *śrāvi* and Gathic Avestan *srāuuī* on the other hand are "direkte Fortsetzer einer intransitiv-passivischen Perfektbildung *$\hat{k}lou̦$-∂*" (Schmidt, 1997c, 567). Schmidt remains reticent about all the transitive members of the same Tocharian Subclass 5, which evidently would defy such an explanation, but at the same time speculates (Schmidt, 1997c, 568) that his PIE *$\hat{k}lou̦$-∂ type was also continued by the "schwundstufigen Typus *maska*" (constituting the prevailingly intransitive Subclass 2/3).

Finally, there is the denominative approach. Adams on various occasions (1978, 280; 1988a, 66f.; 1998, 616) claimed that Class IV presents such as *klautkotär* 'becomes', and various TB Sub V such as *klāṅkā*- 'go by wagon', *klautkā*- 'turn, become', and *skāyā*- 'strive' were denominatives from *kleṅke* 'vehicle', *klautke* 'manner, way', and *skeye* 'effort', respectively (followed with regard to the essential aspect "denominative" by Peters, 1999, 310), but did not comment on the cognate Pt I of Subclass 5 TB *klāṅka*, *klautka*, and TA *skāy*, respectively. Similarly, Hackstein, 1998, 226 explicitly took the Prs IV *orttotär*, TA *artatär** for a denominative, but did not address the question of the status of its Pt I of Subclass 5; of course the only analysis of these preterits consistent with an interpretation of the respective subjunctives and presents as denominatives would be to view them as denominative formations themselves.

Such a claim has indeed already been made more or less explicitly by Winter. Whereas Winter, 1960, 181 was only explicit about the Prs IV *klautkoträ* and the Sub V forms,[48] Winter, 1965, 193 and especially 207 = 2005, 109 and 123 called *swese* 'rain' "a back-formation based on the preterit-subjunctive stem *swāsa-*, representing the reversal of the development found in the derivation of *wāpa-* 'weave' from *wepe* 'Gewebe', *kraupa-* 'gather' from *kraupe* 'collection', *yāta-* 'adorn' from *yetwe* 'Schmuck', etc.". Even more explicitly, Winter, 1990b, 2535f. = 2005, 415f. wrote on the occasion of the 3.sg. Pt I *wāpa*: "zu einer B *wepe* entsprechenden Form wurde ein denominales Verb gebildet. Dabei ist es sinnvoll, davon auszugehen, daß im Zuge der Ableitung eine Längung des **o* der Wurzelsilbe erfolgte, weil nur so das Auftreten des *a*-Umlautes voll verständlich wird; als Parallele bietet sich gr. *strōphao* : *strephō* ‚drehe' an", i.e., strangely enough, he seems to assume here that the root vowel *-ā-* of *wāpa* is precisely *not* due to the *ā*-umlaut postulated by himself, but is to be traced back to a pre-PT **ō*-vowel; note also that στρωφάω is at least descriptively not a denominative, but a deverbative.

Much as one would like to take *tākā-* as a reflex of a PIE active perfect in view of the Greek perfect ἕστηκα (see immediately below), it is hard to see how the PIE active perfect in general could have resulted systematically in Pt III on the one hand (as will be argued in the respective chapter, it is indeed probable that Pt III derives also from the PIE active perfect) and in Pt I, Subclass 5 on the other;[49] note that the perfects with PIE *ō*-grade also turned into Pt III (and Sub I), as per Peters, 2004, 434, fn. 24, and that PPts derived from perfects of aniṭ roots such as *pik-* were not expected to show a PT **-ā-* in front of their suffix. K. T. Schmidt's view on the intransitive members of Subclass 5 alone does not make sense either phonologically (because of Saussure's Law) or morphologically. Generally speaking, none of these derivations from (any kind of) active perfect paradigms can

---

[48] Pace Winter, there is no middle Sub "*klautkaträ*" attested, just active forms.

[49] To be honest, one could expect that some Tocharian roots deriving from PIE seṭ roots analogically introduced root-final PT **-ā-* from full-grade root allomorphs of the pre-PT **CeCa-* type into the active perfect, and therefore adopted Pt I inflection; but as far as I can see, the only likely candidate for such a case is the Pt II TB *k(y)āna-* if from the PIE active perfect stem **ĝeĝŏnh₁-*.

account for the quite heterogeneous behavior of the subclass with respect to valency and voice.[50]

On the other hand, the denominative approach suggested by Winter, and indirectly also by Adams and Hackstein, turns out to be extremely fruitful at a closer inspection of the material.

First, a certain number of Tocharian roots that we meet in Subclass 5, such as *āksᵃ-* 'waken', *ārt(t)⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'love', *aiw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be turned toward', certainly do not have a structure to be expected for a PIE root; the obvious assumption will then be that we are dealing here with denominative formations.[51]

Second, numerous Pt I formations that belong to Subclass 5 have nouns in pre-PT *-o- > TB -e at their side, most of which are clearly of the τόμος or the τομός type, i.e., have a root vowel PT *æ from pre-PT *o; beside *kraupe* 'gathering', *kleṅke* 'vehicle', *klautke* 'manner, way', *wepe* 'paddock', and *skeye* 'effort', which were already mentioned above, there are also *newe* 'cry', and *spel(t)ke* 'zeal'. As for *swese*/ TA *swase* 'rain', it has been argued by Winter, 1965, 193, 207 = 2005, 109, 123 and later by Peters, 2006, 332, fn. 11, that we are facing here a PT back-formation from a PT Pt I < Pt III 3.sg.act. *s(ä)wāsā, and as shown by Winter, 1972, 389 = 1984, 210 = 2005, 161, *spertte* 'behavior' has to be taken for a (NB: inner-TB) "retrograde Bildung" based on a Subclass 5 Pt I as well. Accordingly, the Pt I formations of the type *spārtta* and *swāsa* must have been synchronically associated with the *spertte-* and *swese*-type nouns for quite a long time. Accordingly, the obvious conclusion will be that the majority of Subclass 5, which is actually precisely of the type *paiyka* and *wāpa*, has an (*)ā as its root vowel that derives from PT *æ < pre-PT *o via ā-umlaut, and has a

---

[50] Schmidt, 1974, 29ff. and Winter, 1994a, 293f. = 2005, 474f. advocated an origin from an active perfect also (implicitly) by the argument that many intransitive activa tantum from this subclass have intransitive Class IV presents beside them, which are all media tantum, so that one may be reminded of the γίγνομαι/γέγονα scheme; but such an argument does not take into account the many transitive members of Subclass 5, and quite the same argument could be, and indeed has been, used by Schmidt and Winter with regard to Subclass 2 and 3 preterits and Class III presents, whereas one cannot derive both Subclasses 2/3 and Subclass 5 from a PIE active perfect at the same time.

[51] Note also that the TB Subclass 5 preterit *kawāte-ne* with the PPt *kakāpau* obviously forms one synchronic paradigm with the clearly denominative Prs XII *kawāññentär* 'desire' made from *kāwo* 'desire', and therefore is to be taken as a form of a denominative paradigm descriptively.

denominative origin as well, viz. consists of aorists belonging to denominative present stems built from PIE *o*-stems of the τόμος and τομός types. According to what was stated above, 3.sg. forms of aorists from such denominatives built from PIE *o*-stems then are expected to have ended in Late PIE *-oh$_1$(t) > Early pre-PT *-ō(t), and to have had beside them PPts in pre-PT *-ō-u̯os-, and such preforms would indeed have resulted by sound law in the respective forms attested for paradigms that are activa tantum.[52] As for the rather numerous members of Subclass 5 that seem to be denominatives from PIE *o*-stems as well, but are media tantum, such as *arttāte*/ TA *ārtat*, *kraupāte* / TA *kropat*, one should bear in mind that in PIE, from instr.sg. forms in *-oh$_1$- decasuative, i.e., deinstrumental *to*-formations in *-oh$_1$-to- could be derived, and that by an analogical proportion such as, e.g., verbal adjective *ĝʰu-tó- : 3.sg. middle aorist *(e-)ĝʰu-to = deinstrumental *-oh$_1$-tó- : x, x = 3.sg. deinstrumental middle aorist in *-oh$_1$-to, denominative middle aorists in *-oh$_1$-to were capable of being coined in every branch of IE. As will be argued in Peters, forthc., the Greek type πυργωτός vs. ἐπυργώθη continues precisely such an older pattern *-ōto- vs. *-ōto, which according to him must once have been associated with Greek denominative verbs from *o*-stems. As for Tocharian itself, such an archaic pattern seems to be still attested in historical times by the uncompounded adjective TA *salat* 'flying (animal)' from PT *sælātæ on the one hand, and the TB Pt I (Subclass 5) *salāte* 'arose' (probably also from PT *sælātæ) on the other hand.[53]

If the surface (*)-*ā*- that acts as root vowel in Subclass 5 derives indeed from PT *æ < PIE *o in most of the instances, it is, however, a rather strange and at least remarkable fact that we find *ā* as a root vowel quite consistently also in all forms of the TA paradigms, and even with the members of the subclass that inflect as media tantum.

From a merely formal point of view, according to what was said above, the type *paiyka* is strongly reminiscent of the Lithuanian present type 3.sg./pl. *sãko*, which must have analogically replaced the lautgesetzlich outcome of the PIE *CoCei̯e/o- present type (as per Stang, 1966, 325), and may have started out as the very aorist of it; but,

---

[52] *t*-less Early pre-PT *-ō may have resulted by sound law in Late pre-PT *-ū > Early PT *-u > Late PT *-ä rather than in PT *-ā, to judge from the case of the cardinal number 'eight'.

[53] As is well known, the aforementioned PIE type of deinstrumentals in *-ō-to- was in Tocharian finally replaced by possessive formations in *-o-ti̯o- (> -*etstse*, as, e.g., in *kokaletstse* 'provided with a *kokale*', and TA -*ats*), which consisted of a more complex suffix and a more transparent pre-suffixal vowel.

of course, the final -*o* must go back to *-eh$_2$eh$_1$ or the like, and not to *-oh$_1$.

Note that a denominative approach also nicely fits the fact that the related presents of Class IV inflect as middles only; the same tendency for exclusive middle inflection is otherwise met within the clear denominatives of Prs Class XII.

However, it must be stressed that certainly not all members of Subclass 5 are to be traced back to denominatives from PIE *o*-stems (in *-oh$_1$-). Some of them will rather have started out as primary formations from roots with a root vowel pre-PT *(ā/)a and having as suffix the pre-PT *-ā- typical of the core members of Subclasses 2 and 3 (*āra*, TA *ār*; *asāre*; TA *wāk*; see already Adams, 1988a, 91), or as denominatives from abstract nouns derived from roots with a PT full vowel as root vowel in PIE *-sk̂eh$_2$-, a suffix otherwise met in Subclasses 1 through 4 (probably all members of Subclass 5 ending in TA/TB (*)-*tkā*- and (*)-*skā*-), and will have replaced PT *-å̆wæṣ- by PT *-āwæṣ- in the PPt just because of their root vowel (*)*ā*.[54]

Finally, there is *tākā-*, the Pt I of *nes-/ ^{A}nas-* and Sub V of both *nes-/ ^{A}nas-* and ^{AB}*mäsk^ä-* denoting 'be, become'. On account of the Greek perfect ἕστηκα, ἕσταμεν one would, of course, want to derive *tākā-* from a PIE perfect *ste-stoh$_2$-k-(/*ste-sth$_2$-), but as Tocharian results of such a perfect one should rather have expected a Pt III and a Sub I stem *tāk(ä)-*. In order to explain the presence of the unwarranted stem-final -*ā*-, on the one hand one could resort to the principle of hypercorrection, pointing out that the semantically related root *mäsk^ä-* 'become' had irregularly weakened the PT Pt I stem *mäskā- into *mäskä- in pre-TA, so that it finally became a member of Pt III in this branch of Tocharian; on the other hand, one could assume that pre-PT still had preserved an irregular allomorphy *stestōk-/ *stesta-, and that resulting PT *(°)tāk(ä)- and *(°)tā- were finally blended into *tākā-*.

Note that descriptively, an alternative stem TA *tāk(ä)-* can indeed be set up in order to account for the 1.pl. act. Pt I TA *tākmäs* and 2.sg. Ipv I TA *päṣtāk-ñi*; though TA *tām*, TA *tāt*, TA *tāṣ*, etc. hardly attest to the existence of a pre-PT *k*-less stem allomorph *(°)(s)ta-, see Peters, 2006, 334, fn. 16.

---

[54] With the possible exception of PPt *ārskoṣ*, if -*oṣ* in this form indeed goes back to PT *-å̆ųæs'ä.

7.3.6. *Subclass 6*

As already pointed out in the section on Subclasses 1 and 4, *ñätkatai* may be a form belonging to a denominative with an *e*-grade of the root, and may therefore just have preserved the original root vowel and/or palatalization; as for *lyipā-* beside and instead of expected *lipā-*, this may be a blend of the lautgesetzlich outcome of PIE *lip-, which would have been PT *l'äp-, and the regular analogical substitute of PIE *lip-, to be expected within ablauting verbal paradigms, which would have been PT *läyp-.

7.3.7. *Subclass 7*

As for the seemingly palatalizing root vowel (*)-*ā*- that shows up in this subclass[55] (and in the clearly related TA imperfect class of the *lyāk* type),[56] PT *-*æ*- from pre-PT *-*ē*- is, of course, the obvious candidate. In my view, this will imply, however, that the forms of *säl*[(a)]- 'fly' do not belong here from a diachronic point of view, as will be argued in detail in Malzahn, in print a.

    As for *lyawā-ne* and *plyāwa*, both preterits seem to belong to PIE seṭ roots (*√leu̯h₃, cf. Gk. λοέω 'wash', and *√mleu̯H, cf. Ved. *bravīmi* 'speak'). Accordingly, we simply seem to have Narten preterits from seṭ roots that, because of the root-final PT *ā resulting from PIE *H, joined Pt I instead of Pt III, where we regularly find the outcomes of Narten preterits from aniṭ roots. As for the root-final PT *ā absent in the PPt, this can simply be due to Winter's rule (1965, 204 = 2005, 120) which says that unstressed PT *-wāwV turned into -wV-.[57]

    Therefore, the only member of Subclass 7 for which there is a potentially diagnostic PPt attested at its side is actually *lyakā-ne* etc. (formally = TA imperfect *lyāk*), which has an archaic-looking PPt *lyelyku/ lyelykoṣ* that must go back to PT *l'æl'äkäwä with stress on the initial syllable. This PPt clearly looks like a PPt belonging to a

---

[55] With the possible exception of [AB]*lu?*- 'rub', which is more likely A-characterless in contrast to [AB]*lu*[ä]- 'send'.

[56] As a matter of fact, Rasmussen, 1992 = 1999, 568ff. seems not to accept this equation, although he is not explicit about the Pt I forms of the *lyakāwa* type.

[57] As for the existence of a preterit *mlēu̯H-t beside a present/imperfect formation *mleu̯H-t(i), compare the preterit *bʰēr-t standing beside *bʰer-(e-)t(i).

Narten preterit that had joined Pt III, which fits the fact that the PIE root that I think was basic to *lyakā-ne* etc., i.e., *√leĝ 'collect',[58] was an aniṭ root in PIE. The obvious conclusion will be that Tocharian had inherited a PIE Narten preterit *lēĝ- from *√leĝ 'collect', for which additional evidence can be found in other branches such as Italic and Albanian (see especially Adams, DoT, 550, with due reference to Lane, 1948, 307f., who, however, wrongly claimed that *lēĝ- had been an old PIE *perfect* stem; for some additional evidence for Narten behavior of the root see Malzahn, 2007, 241, fn. 16), and that this preterit had secondarily came under the influence of another stem, preferably a preterit stem, built from its very root, which for some reason ended in pre-PT *ā or *a. Luckily enough, such a stem is amply attested in Tocharian, i.e., a Sub V = Prs V stem (*)*läkā- 'see' (with accentuation according to the basic rule, i.e., no initial accent, in Tocharian B). Since deriving this stem from a proto-form in PIE *-H- or *-oh₁- would make no sense morphologically, it is best to assume that this pre-PT present stem had been built by the *tēzzi* principle on a pre-PT aorist stem *läkā-, which would have been just one more of many other zero-grade aorists in pre-PT *-ā-, but evidently one as transitive as Lat. *uidē- 'see'* and Gk *ṷidē- 'know'.*[59]

The same kind of analysis would indeed perfectly fit *śalāka* 'followed'; of course we cannot be dealing here with a root ending in PIE *-KH-, because a laryngeal must have stood already immediately in front of the *-K-. On the other hand, TA *kälkā-ṃ, kalkar* 'went' attests to a Pt I of Subclass 3, i.e., a zero-grade preterit in pre-PT *ā, made from the same root. The obvious conclusion will be that *śalāka* is due to a blend of a Narten preterit and a zero-grade aorist formation in pre-PT *ā made from the same root as well.

As for *ṣtamāwa*, it is, strictly speaking, rather unclear whether what we have here is a PIE seṭ or a PIE aniṭ root; its transitivity, however, fits the transitive valency met within the root *läk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'see'. If one is willing to assume suffixal pre-PT *-ā- here, the coexistence of intransitive active PT *st'ämā- and transitive active PT *st'æmā- could indeed be neatly explained by the above-stated original indifference of the pre-PT suffix *-ā- with respect to valency.

The conclusion for the members of Subclass 7 not derived from PIE seṭ roots and the obviously related TA imperfects of the type *lyāk* and

---

[58] This etymological connection was first proposed by Holthausen and Brands, see Pedersen, 1941, 176 and Adams, DoT, 550.

[59] Maybe that preterit *läkā- is still reflected by PPt-based *lelkor*.

pārat then will be that all prototypical forms were Narten preterits blended with (quite often transitive) zero-grade aorists in pre-PT *ā built from the same root.

From a typological point of view, these formations then seem to be reminiscent of the Lithuanian preterits of the *bėriaũ* type (on which see, e.g., Mathiassen, 1974, 63ff. with ref.), for which I adopt the view that they are based on blends of Narten preterits such as PIE *bʰēr- with zero-grade aorists in *-ē (as per van Wijk, 1915, 367ff., who also, like Lane, believed that preterital stems with root vowel *-ē- such as PIE *bʰēr- had started out as *perfect* stems; but a quite different solution can be found, e.g., in Stang, 1966, 390), and which typically go together with *e*-grade *i̯e/o*-presents, much as *lyakāwa* is joined by an *e*-grade PPt.

I employ the term "Narten preterits",[60] because it is not at all clear whether we have Narten aorists or Narten imperfects here, the existence of asigmatic active Narten aorists in PIE being strongly denied by both the Freiburg school and the Harvard school.[61] According to the Freiburg school, stems used as preterits, that have *-ē- as their root vowel with no respective Narten-present forms attested beside them, such as *lēǵ-, must have somehow resulted from reduplicated imperfect or perfect stems such as *le-l(o)ǵ-,[62] and the TB *lyakāwa*-type preterits and TA *lyāk*-type imperfects were indeed explicitly explained in such a way by Hilmarsson, 1990, 111f. ("it might be suggested that it represent [sic] an Indo-European reduplicated intensive-iterative formation of the structure *Ce-CoC-*"), but, of course, the result of such a proto-form could only have been TB †*lākawa*. According to the Harvard school (Jasanoff apud Eyþórsson, 1993, 56, fn. 35, and 1997, 242f.; Jasanoff, 1998, 306ff.; 2003, 193, 224; Weiss, 1993, 178ff.; 1996, 674), in PIE there existed ē-grade preterits of the type *lēǵ-, and they are reflected by the Tocharian *lyakāwa*-type Pt I and the TA *lyak*-type imperfects. However, these not only started out as imperfects to Narten presents lost later, but always remained

---

[60] Pinault, 1989, 149 also just uses the term "prétérit".

[61] It would not make sense to derive *lyakāwa*, TA *lyāk*, Lat. *lēgī*, etc. from perfects with ē-grade, as has been done by Lane, who followed a tradition established by Brugmann; see Cowgill, 1957, 32ff.

[62] This strategy actually goes back to Bopp and Adolf Holtzmann, see Cowgill, 1957, 21ff. For a special variant of this strategy see now Schumacher, 2005, 591ff. and 2006, 125.

imperfects and never turned into aorists.[63] On the other hand, there is also a long-standing tradition of scholars who accept(ed) the existence of asigmatic active Narten aorists, starting with Bechtel and Meillet (see Cowgill, 1957, 35ff.) and now represented by Peters (e.g., 1980, 314f.) and Tremblay (most recently Tremblay, 2005). Adams evidently also subscribes to the latter view, and explicitly called *lyāka* = TA *lyāk* the outcome of a "long vowel (Indo-European *$\bar{e}$) aorist" in Adams, 1978, 283 and 1988a, 87f.

Finally, with regard to *ṣṭamāwa*, it may be appropriate to address here briefly the question of a relationship between the Subclass 7 preterits of Class I and the Class II preterits of Tocharian B. Subclass 7 Pt I *ṣṭamāwa* evidently has the same meaning, and shares most of the morphological traits wiht the probably frequent, important, and even pivotal Class II Pt *ś(c)āma-*. It differs from *ś(c)āma-* only with respect to the outcome of initial PT *śt'- (by showing the result of an irregular metathesis of palatalization *śt'- > *s't-, see chap. Sound Laws 1.7.) and the accent (the latter difference may be explained in terms of the presence or absence of a reduplication syllable containing a reduplication vowel PT *-'ä-). I think it is unavoidable to assume a historical relationship between these two stems, and since *ṣṭamāwa* is evidently a synchronically irregular form and therefore best taken for an archaism, the obvious conclusion will be that it should be considered a kind of missing link between the *lyakāwa*-type and the Class II preterits. It will assumed that the pivotal forms of Pt II[64] started out as Subclass 7 preterits, but then for some reason underwent either a secondary (undoubtedly analogical) accent shift or a secondary (also no doubt analogical) prehistoric reduplication

---

[63] In this respect Jasanoff and Weiss differ from Kortlandt, 2007, 155, who also assumes that the *lēgī/lyāka*-type preterits started out as imperfects, but then claims that such imperfects "became root aorists by a differentiation between present and aorist stems", the root vowel *-$\bar{e}$- having been "phonetically regular in the monosyllabic 2nd and 3rd sg. forms". Note that such an idea was adduced first by Karl Ljungstedt in 1887; see Cowgill, 1957, 35f.

[64] I think it extremely likely that Pt II *śārsa-* also ranked among the pivotal forms, because it morphologically forms an equation with the TA imperfect *śārs*. The semantic difference between the two paradigms can be accounted for by the above-stated original indifference of the pre-PT suffix *-ā- with respect to valency; note that the zero-grade stem allomorph PT *kärsā- can also take on both the grundverb meaning 'know' and the causative meaning 'make know(n)'.

process, as in principle already suggested by Adams, 1993b, 37, fn. 2 and Beckwith, 1996, 176, fn. 5.[65] The reason that *ṣṭamāwa* escaped that secondary reshaping can only be that it did not seem to have word-initial palatalization; but then the further implication will be that the morphological category that triggered the analogical shift (most likely a present) had (1) consistently word-initial palatalization itself at least in the sg. active, and had (2) initial accent or still an extra reduplication syllable containing a reduplication vowel PT *’ä itself, which implies that it therefore (3) must have differed more or less from the historical kausativum presents (as correctly seen by Hilmarsson, 1991, 48ff.; Eyþórsson, 1997; Kim, 2003, 225), which obviously both lacked word-initial palatalization as a regular feature and did not go back to forms with regular reduplication themselves (as rightly argued by Kim, 2003, 225f., fn. 75). These assumptions will indeed be further confirmed, especially by the evidence of the Class II imperatives, see already Hilmarsson, 1991, 48ff.

7.3.8. *General summary Subclasses 1-7*

According to what has been stated so far, the stem-final PT *-ā- met in all Pt I formations (and also in all of the related Sub V formations) has as a rule, and with rather very few exceptions only, nothing at all to do with root-final laryngeals of PIE seṭ roots, in contrast to what is now usually believed in mainstream Indo-European studies (see Klingenschmitt, 1982, 108f.; Schmidt, 1982, 366 and 1985, 433; Kortlandt, 1984 = 2007, 72; Oettinger, 1984, 196f.; Hackstein, 1995, 16ff., with ref. 16, fn. 3). As I hope has become clear, the evidence rather fully confirms the opposite view of Jasanoff, who quite correctly pointed out that there is an "enormous preponderance of descriptively "*aniṭ*" roots among the verbs that form *ā*-subjunctives" (Jasanoff, 1992, 133).

---

[65] See also Jasanoff, 1998, 305, fn. 24: "The Toch. B causative preterite type *cāla* 'lifted' rests on an elaboration of the same category" [i.e., as the one reflected by Imp TA *pārat*]. I opt with Beckwith for reduplication, because it becomes then possible to derive the Pt II formations of TB and TA from one single common source, see the detailed discussion in chap. Pt II 8.2.4.

7.3.9. *The type klyauṣa*

Since Pedersen, 1941, 179ff., it has been customary[66] to connect the *ā*-preterit type with palatalized root final (*klyauṣa*/ TA *klyoṣ*) with the palatalizing TA imperfect of Class III, which is, in fact, the most productive TA imperfect class. This imperfect is built by adding an invariable suffix *-ā-* to the present stem, and the present-stem final is further palatalized (if palatalizable), as, e.g., in the 2.pl.act. Imp TA *klyoṣās*. Pedersen proposed to derive this palatalizing *-ā-suffix, which undergoes neither weakening nor loss, from PIE *-ē-. He was followed by Lane, 1953a, 54ff., who compared a number of non-present *ē*-formations from other branches, like the η-aorist type Gk. ἐχάρην and the Balto-Slavic *ē*-preterit. This theory is basically followed by Adams, 1978, 285 and 1988a, 90f., who thinks that word-final PIE *ē resulted in PT *ā.[67] Winter, 1994, 407 = 2005, 456, on the other hand, argues that if one starts with a pre-PT suffix *-ē- > PT *-æ- and then assumes that the preterital suffix *-ā-[68] was added, one would first get a sequence *-ā-ā- via *ā*-umlaut, then *-ā-y-ā- (with intrusion of a glide), and finally via contraction the invariable suffix *-ā-* of Tocharian A subject neither to weakening nor to loss (*-ēā- was also advocated by Pisani, see VW II/2, 94). Winter himself, however, favors another theory, on which see below.

Jasanoff, 1987, 95f. subscribes to the connection of the *klyauṣa*-type preterits with the TA *klyoṣā*-type imperfects, and also subsumes here the likewise palatalized preterits of Classes IV and V. To him all of these are "clearly not of very great antiquity". According to Jasanoff, imperfects (from optatives) in (*)-*i*-, because of the lack of old aorists made from the respective roots, were also used "with the value of true preterits", and in this function then "mechanically replaced" the *-i- by *-ā-*. In Tocharian A the *-ā-* "was subsequently introduced into the imperfect as well", so that the "newly established opposition between impf. *klyauṣi* and pret. *klyauṣā* was secondarily eliminated" in that language. He correctly points out that the respective Tocharian roots continue PIE suffixed present stem formations (in *-s(k)-* and *-(n)nu̯-* in the case of *pänn-*, but see above), "the inherited aorists" of which

---

[66] With the exception of Van Windekens and Peters, 2006, see below in the main text.

[67] Further possible examples are mentioned in Adams, 1988a, 19.

[68] Winter seems to suggest here that the preterital suffix *-ā- itself was just a generalized result of PIE *-ē- turned into PT *-ā- via *ā*-umlaut in front of verbal endings containing a PT vowel *-ā-.

would "have been formally quite remote from their presents", and therefore "natural candidates for morphological replacement". He does not discuss the case of *campya*, but says that TA *klyoṣā* owes its -*ā* to "the analogical influence of the rest of the paradigm".[69]

Klingenschmitt, 1994, 407 = 2005, 432, fn. 165; 1994a, 230 = 2005, 445 (see also 1975, 158f. = 2005, 142f.) wants to derive both the *klyauṣa*/ TA *klyoṣ*-type preterits and the TA *klyoṣā*-type imperfects from PIE imperfects, i.e., he thinks that *klēu̯set became *kl'æws'- and then acquired an additional -*ā*- from the continuants of PIE seṭ roots via analogy. He does not explain either *campya* or the quite heterogeneous behavior of (*)-*ā*- in Tocharian A.

A very different approach is taken by Winter, 1994, 406ff. = 2005, 455ff. Winter points to the fact that the *klyauṣā*-type preterit forms usually are not subject to weakening by vowel balance in Tocharian A, cf., e.g., 3.sg.mid. TA *klyoṣāt* vs. 3.sg.mid. TA *pekat* (being one of the exceptions to the principle of vowel balance given in TEB I, 45, § 11,2, Anm. 1). He then tries to explain this absence of weakening by assuming that the ubiquitous PT *-*ā*- "from the preterit paradigms of stems such as TA *kärsā*- 'know' or TA *tāka*- 'become'" were attached to thematic present stem allomorphs such as *kl'æws'ä-, and that *kl'æws'ää- finally turned into pre-TA *kl'æws'äyā- with an additional glide, but into pre-TB *kl'æws'ā-. As far as I can see, Winter addresses neither *campya* nor TA *klyoṣ.*

A structurally similar solution is later put forward by Kim, 2003, 194, fn. 6; 2003[70] who also argues that we do not so much have to do with a mere palatalization of the root final, than with a sequence *-äy-, which, according to him, is also to be inferred from forms with *y*-insertion like *campya.*[71] He therefore sets up a sequence "*-C^y-əy-ā-, with an additional syllable *-əy- between stem and preterit marker *-ā-", not only for pre-Tocharian A, but for pre-Tocharian B as well. He then further connects this Pt I class with the Class VII preterit. Kim assumes that both preterit classes have a common origin, and were

---

[69] As far as the TA imperfect type only is concerned, a similar analysis was put forward by Couvreur, 1947a, 65f. (and accepted by VW II/2, 95f.; one has to say that Van Windekens' explanation in VW II/2, 134 and 142 by which -*ṣ*- in the *klyauṣa*/ TA *klyoṣ*-type Pt I was palatalized by the PPt in *-e-u̯ent- is morphologically absurd).

[70] Lecture given on 11 Jun 2003 at Harvard University, to be published in MSS.

[71] As already stated above, this is impossible because of the accentuation of *campya.*

differentiated by a sound law. According to him, roots of the *klyauṣa*-type preterit all end in a "coronal", while the examples of Pt VII roots, he claims, all end in "consonants other than coronal stops". He further proposes a sound law by which accented schwa vanishes very early after coronal (or "palatal?") consonants, hence *kl'æws'-ā́yā- > *klyauṣa*, but is retained after non-coronal consonants. As for the absence of an *iya*-variant of *campya*, he claims that all attestations of *campya* underwent metrical shortening (i.e., loss of accented *-ä-). To be sure, all attestations listed in WTG, 244 sub *cämp-* indeed come from metrical passages;[72] however, one instance of the 3.sg. *campya* in H 149.312 a 4 (not in WTG) certainly comes from a prose text. As for the TA imperfects of Class III, Kim derives them from much the same ancestral forms and further states that "the limited TA corpus does not appear to attest any examples of imperfects to present stems ending in a non-coronal consonant"; but this is incorrect, because there are at least 3.pl. TA *sälypär* from ^A*sälp^ä*- 'glow', and 3.sg. TA *ypā*, etc. from ^A*ya(p)*- 'do'.

Kim further explicitly claims that all of these preterits derive from optatives to thematic present formations that "came to be used iteratively", from which use the imperfect function derived. Some time later, "this same optative/imperfect formation was generalized to punctual past-tense reference", and as a consequence the past-tense suffix *-ā- was added in the 3.sg. active already in PT times, but only if the forms were used as preterits. Since the type *klyauṣa* is always associated with thematic (subjunctive) stems, Kim himself in the end that considers it strange that all those optatives from thematic stems had palatalizing *-ī- from *-ih$_1$- instead of non-palatalizing reflexes of *-o-ih$_1$-; and therefore he toys with the idea of a "regular deletion of *-o- before *-i-?? Cf. derivates in *-i-, *-iyo- to thematic nouns, e.g. *ék'wios to *ek'wos" with ref. to Schindler, 1976 and Mayrhofer, 1986. However, neither Schindler, 1976 nor Mayrhofer, 1986 (who, moreover, discusses the problem of thematic *-o-ih$_1$-/*-oi̯h$_1$- on p. 131) claim such a (mor)phonological rule to have existed; Schindler, 1976,

---

[72] As for the preservation of word-final -*ä* in the 2.pl. Pt *cämpyāsä* in 32 b 7 (metrical, pāda-final), one cannot argue that this proves the non-existence of a variant †*cämpiyās* which, of course, could also have provided the additional syllable metrically required, since occurrence of *o* mobile or preservation of word-final -*ä* was exactly to be expected in pāda-final context even if a variant with -*iyā*- would have been available.

351f., on the contrary, explicitly speaks of a substitution of the thematic vowel *-o- by *-i-.

With the notable exceptions of Van Windekens, and maybe Adams and probably Krause/Thomas, so far all scholars mentioned tried to explain both the *klyauṣa*/ TA *klyoṣ*-type Pt I and the TA Imperfect III by setting up one single common ancestor category. Until recently no scholar has addressed the strange fact that in Tocharian A stem-final -ā- never undergoes weakening by vowel balance and is lost word-finally only in the two 3.sg. active preterit forms TA *klyoṣ* and TA *we*. This problem has been taken into account only by Winter and Kim, who tried to explain the strange behavior of TA -ā- by setting up a disyllabic proto-form for what they thought had been one single common morpheme. However, none of these scholars has been able to interpret *campya* as a lautgesetzlich form. On the other hand, the strategy of Krause/Thomas to take this form for an inherited *-i̯ā-preterit fits phonologically, but does not lead anywhere morphologically. Moreover, Winter's and Kim's theories are at variance with the real outcomes of PT *-s'äyā, *-s'äyāC- in the paradigms of the feminine variants of the adjectives ending in PT *-s'äyæ-, which were TA -ṣi and TA -ṣyāṃ/-ṣ(ṣ)āṃ, respectively (see TG, 70, § 108; 160, § 254). Much as the sound change proposed by Kim — which would have turned forms with Early PT *-s'äyā(-) into Late PT forms with simple *-ṣā(-) even in cases where the accent was originally placed on the *ä*-vowel — seems reasonable from a general phonologist's point of view (see Méndez Dosuna, 1993, 127f.; McCone, 2006, 266ff.; Peters, 2006, 343, fn. 43 with ref.), it simply does not tally with the facts of Tocharian, as also becomes evident from other forms such as the Pt VII *wṣīya* and *kraṣīyate* (ignored by Kim). Of course, one could claim that lautgesetzlich 3.sg.act. TA **klyoṣi*, 3.pl.act. TA **klyoṣ(ṣ)ār* had been leveled to TA *klyoṣā*, TA *klyoṣār* in the Imperfect III, but such a strategy could not be of help with the preterit forms TA *klyoṣ* and TA *we*. The *ē*-aorist theory, which is still accepted by Adams, cannot account at all for the remarkable restriction of the type, described by Jasanoff, 1987, 95f. As for Klingenschmitt's theory, it has to be pointed out in addition that it does not explain why PT **kl'æws'ā* with palatalized -*s*- was preferred to PT **kl'æwsā*. Furthermore, as correctly pointed out by Peters, 2006, 341f., fn. 34,

there must have existed preterits ending in *non*-palatalizing *-ā- that stood beside respective athematic and even thematic stems.[73]

Since none of the solutions just mentioned was capable of explaining all of the relevant forms, a completely new and different strategy has been recently adopted by Peters in Peters, 2006 (see already Peters, 2004, 432f., fn. 19). According to Peters, 2006, 340ff. it is not possible to derive the *ā*-preterit type *klyauṣa*/ TA *klyoṣ*, Pt IV, and PT V together with the TA imperfect III from one common diachronic basis. To be sure, the TA imperfect III indeed requires a disyllabic sequence to underlie TA invariable -*ā*-, whereas TB *campya*, TA *klyoṣ*, and TA *we* cannot have had any underlying disyllabic sequence at all. In the Pt VII, the variants -*iyā*- and -*yā*- are attested in both prose and metrical passages in any kind of Tocharian B variety, while the TB preterit type with palatalized root-final consonant in general as well as the special case of *cämpyā*- never show a disyllabic variant, which cannot be a coincidence. There are enough non-metrical attestations of *klyauṣa*-type formations where we should expect a former disyllabic suffix to have been preserved, and, what is more, even if such unsyncopated forms were missing due to mere chance, the syncopated forms should have shown a different accent pattern.

Accordingly, we seem to be faced with the problem of a monosyllabic and one-moric suffix *-yā- underlying all the TB *ā*-preterit types and the TA *ā*-preterit forms 3.sg. TA *klyoṣ*, TA *we* on the one hand, and a disyllabic suffix underlying the TA imperfect Class III, the TA Classes IV and V (with the exception of TA *we*), and, in addition, also the active plural and all middle forms of the TA *klyoṣ*-type preterits on the other. Peters, l.c., now claims that the frequent stem *klyauṣā*- indeed was the pivotal form and had served as

---

[73] Peters' argumentation has to be refined, however. None of the paradigms he refers to have a *synchronic* subjunctive stem of Class II. *ᴬᴮpälk*- 'shine' can only have had an athematic subjunctive stem, and is hence not diagnostic for the problem of *ā*-preterits beside thematic stems. As for the other examples brought forth by Peters, Prs II from *räss*- is best explained otherwise, see s.v. in the verbal index, and the present stem *wärsk*- goes back to *wäräsk-, whereas the Pt I stem *wärskā*- derives from *wärsk- with no *-ä- inserted. Nevertheless, there are even some more examples attesting to a pattern primary present/subjunctive with no stem-final PT *-ā- vs. a preterit ending in PT *-ā-; see the verbal index s.v. *kraup⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'gather', *miw⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'tremble', and *sāmp⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'take away, deprive of'. Finally, one could even add a Pt I stem PT *næsā- beside PT *næsä- 'be' here which is probably evidenced by the TA PPt *nāṃtsu*.

a prototypical model for the whole class, and that it derived from an optative $*\hat{k}leu̯s\text{-}ih_1\text{-}t/*\hat{k}leu̯s\text{-}ih_1\text{-}CV$ originally belonging to a Narten-like inflected athematic s-present $*\hat{k}lēu̯s\text{-}/*\hat{k}leu̯s\text{-}$, by assuming PIE $*\text{-}ih_1\text{-}t >$ pre-PT $*\text{-}i̯a\text{-}t$, but PIE $*\text{-}ih_1\text{-}CV\text{-} >$ pre-PT $*\text{-}ī\text{-}CV\text{-}$. Much later, pre-Tocharian B generalized PT $*\text{-}i̯ā\text{-}$ from pre-PT $*\text{-}i̯a\text{-}$ through the whole paradigm, whereas in pre-Tocharian A, every $*\text{-}ī(\text{-})$ was suffixed by PT $*\text{-}ā(\text{-})$ in non-modal formations, i.e., both preterits and imperfects. Finally, Peters claims, the resulting pre-TA $*\text{-}īyā\text{-}$ somehow turned into bimoric, invariable TA $\text{-}ā\text{-}$.

This scenario exactly fits the material inasmuch as the two certainly archaic 3.sg. preterit forms of the type *klyauṣa* in Tocharian A, i.e., TA *klyoṣ* and TA *we*, indeed have non-bimoric $*\text{-}ā$, while all remaining preterit forms were not subject to vowel balance, thereby attesting to the former presence of an additional syllable.

As for *campya* itself, Peters explained it as a direct reflex of an acrostatic s-less aorist optative $*temp\text{-}ih_1\text{-}t$ standing beside indicative $*tēmp\text{-}s\text{-}$ (attested by TA Pt III *campäs*), much in the same way as in Avestan s-less optatives in $\text{-}ī\text{-}$ stand beside s-aorist indicatives.

A remaining phonological problem is the question whether a sequence $VCi̯V$ should not have led to $VC'C'V$ with a geminate, see the discussion and ref. in Peters, 2006, 343ff.[74] To be sure, there exist at least two relevant forms with a geminate written in front of the $\text{-}ā\text{-}$: from *lāṃs-* 'work on, perform', beside non-geminated *lamṣāmai*, *lamṣātai*, *lamṣāte*, and *lamṣānte* there are also attested once a 3.sg. *lamṣṣāte* and once a 3.pl. *lamṣṣānte*. The 3.sg. *lamṣṣāte* is found in a text from Sängim, the 3.pl. *lamṣṣānte* in a business document, whereas the other forms show up in standard TB documents, and therefore one would rather interpret these forms as informal-style variants or writings[75] than as archaic forms with preserved $\text{-}ṣṣ\text{-}$ from $*\text{-}sy\text{-}$.

Granted that Peters was correct with respect to his basic claim that the *klyauṣa*/ TA *klyoṣ*-type Pt I and the TA Imperfect III must go back to different ancestor paradigms, and granted also that none of the details in his reconstruction can easily be proven wrong,[76] this does

---

[74] Kim makes the ad hoc proposal of a degemination after diphthong /ew/ for *klyauṣa*.

[75] Note the 3.pl. Prs *lamṣṣeṃtär* is also attested in a business document and also shows a non-standard TB kind of gemination.

[76] This also holds for his claim that the Pt VII went back to PT $*\text{-}īyā\text{-}$ as well, i.e., $*\text{-}äyyā\text{-}$ rather than PT $*\text{-}äyā\text{-}$; as for the forms of Pt VII showing syncope of the PT $*\text{-}ä\text{-}$ standing in front of *one single -y-*, he could resort to

not imply that his approach is necessarily correct itself. As for *campya*, this need not be a lautgesetzlich form after all. Since this preterit belongs to an extremely frequently used verb, one could easily venture the idea that *-py-* is here just an *irregular* result of PT *-p'*- which was borrowed from the most formal styles into the normal styles. I will use the very same strategy in order to explain surface *(ṣ)py-* in the initial of a couple of TB Pt II forms. On the other hand, it would not be unreasonable to assume that the invariable *-ā-* showing up in TA *klyoṣ*-type Pt I forms is nothing old, but an intruder from the TA Imperfect III; note that Peters himself has to admit that the 3.sg. active forms of Pt IV and Pt V TA *pyāṣṭṣā-m*, TA *ākṣiññā/ākṣñā*, TA *okṣiññā-ci*, and TA *weñā-ṃ* are to be explained that way. Therefore, Jasanoff's solution might still be viable as far as the preterit forms alone are concerned. As for the morpheme of TA Imperfect III itself, PT *-'äyā-* may be taken to be a more likely candidate than Peters' PT *-'īyā- = *-'äyyā-*; and as argued above, the invariable *-ā-* we find in the historical TA Imperfect III could indeed be interpreted as a result of paradigmatic leveling, as already suggested by Jasanoff, 1987, 96, fn. 10 (i.e., an original opposition 3.sg. act. *-i* vs. *-ā-* in the rest of the paradigm would be required to have been leveled into uniform *-ā(-))*.[77]

---

assuming degemination, which must have been quite frequent a process in the informal styles of Tocharian.

[77] Alternatively, one could toy with the idea that the results of an informal-style change PT *-Cäyā- > pre-TA *-Cyã- had been borrowed into the more formal styles of TA, but only within the verbal system; see for possible parallels from dialects of Doric Greek Méndez Dosuna, 1993; note that TA *sälypār* and TA *ypā* have to be considered analogical forms anyway.

THE CLASS II PRETERIT

8.1.   SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRETERIT CLASS II

A preterit of Class II is formed from 78 verbs (44 TB, 61 TA, 27 TB = TA; only PPt attested: 8 TB, 20 TA, 2 TB = TA):

kätk⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. IV/ *ᴬkätk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. IV 'let pass, cross' (TA only PPt), *kän*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I/ *ᴬkän-* Kaus. I 'fulfill (a wish)', *ᴬkärn-* 'hit', *kärs*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. IV/ *ᴬkärs*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. IV 'make know(n)', *ᴬkäl-* 'bear', *käl*ᵃ*-* Kaus. IV 'let lead', *ᴬkäln-* Kaus. I 'let resound', *ᴬkälp*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. IV 'bestow', *ᴬkäl(t)s*ᵃ*-* Kaus. IV 'let be pressed', *ᴬkäs-* Kaus. IV 'let come to extinction', *ku-* Kaus. III/IV '?', *kuk-* '± tire, exhaust' (only PPt), *kutk*ᵃ⁽ˀ⁾*-* Kaus. III/IV '?' (only PPt), *klutk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I/ *ᴬlutk*⁽ᵃ⁾ˀ*-* 'make, turn into', *ñäsk-* 'demand, desire', *ᴬtätk-* '?', *ᴬtäp-* 'proclaim' (only PPt), *täl*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. III/ *ᴬtäl*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. III 'lift up, carry', *tuk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I/ *ᴬtpuk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. ? 'hide' (TA only PPt), *ᴬtränk-* Kaus. I 'cling to' (only PPt), *trik*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. II/ *ᴬtrik*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. II act. 'lead astray', mid. 'faint' (TA only PPt), *triw*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I/ *ᴬtriw*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I 'mix' (TA only PPt), *ᴬtrisk-* Kaus. I 'let boom', *ᴬtrus-* 'tear to pieces', *ᴬnätk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'hold off', *näm-* Kaus. III 'bend (tr)' (only PPt)/ *ᴬnäm*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'bow (itr)' (only PPt), *närk-/ ᴬnärk-* 'keep away, refrain' (TA only PPt), *närs-* 'urge', *nip-* '?', *nu*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. III/ *ᴬnu-* 'shout', *ᴬpärs*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. III 'sprinkle, water', *pälk-* Kaus. I 'illuminate, show', *ᴬpälk*⁽ᵃ⁾ˀ*-* 'burn, torment', *pyutk-/ ᴬpyutk-* act. 'come into being', mid. 'establish', *pränk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I/ *ᴬpränk*ˀ*-* Kaus. I 'reject', *prutk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I/ *ᴬprutk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I 'shut, fill up', *ᴬplutk-* Kaus. I '± protrude', *ᴬmäs-* '?' (only PPt), *märs*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. IV 'make forget', *mäsk-* '(ex)change', *mi-/ ᴬmi-* 'hurt, harm' (TA only PPt), *yāt*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. II 'enable, tame', *yät*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I/ *ᴬyät-* 'adorn, decorate', *ᴬyär*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I 'bathe', *ritt*⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬritw*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I 'connect, etc.', *ᴬlänk-* Kaus. II 'let dangle' (only PPt), *läm*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I/ *ᴬläm*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I 'set, let subside', *ᴬlitk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. III 'remove' (only PPt), *ᴬluk-* Kaus. II 'illuminate', *ᴬwārp*⁽ᵃ⁾ˀ*-* 'surround' (only PPt), *wäks*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I '± make turn away', *ᴬwät-* Kaus. III 'erect', *wätk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. II/ *ᴬwätk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. II 'command', *ᴬwäm*ᵃ*-* Kaus. ? '?', *wär-/ ᴬwär-* 'practice' (only PPt), *ᴬwär-* '?' (only PPt), *ᴬwärk*ˀ*-* 'turn' (only PPt), *ᴬwärt*⁽ᵃ⁾ˀ*-* 'throw', *wäl*ˀ*-* 'bend' (only PPt), *ᴬwälts*ˀ*-* 'sum up' (only PPt), *ᴬwäs-* Kaus. I 'dress sb.', *wik*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. II/ *ᴬwik*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. II 'drive away, remove', *śänm-* 'bind; determine (rules)', *ṣärk-/ ᴬṣärk-* 'surpass' (TA only PPt), *ᴬṣärp-* 'indicate, explain', *ᴬsätk-* Kaus. I 'spread', *säl*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. II 'throw' (only PPt), *ᴬsay-* 'satiate, satisfy', *stäm*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I/ *ᴬṣtäm*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I 'put, place', *spārtt*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I/ *ᴬspārtw*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I 'turn', *spänt*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. I 'make trust' (only PPt), *spärk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus.

II/ ^A^*spärk^(a)^*- Kaus. II 'cause to disappear, destroy', ^A^*sruk*- 'kill', ^A^*tsäm^(a)^*- Kaus. I 'increase, cause to grow', *tsär^(a)^*- Kaus. I/ ^A^*tsär^(a)^*- Kaus. I 'separate', *tsälp^(a)^*- Kaus. I/ ^A^*tsälp^(a)^*- Kaus. I 'redeem, free' (TA only PPt), *tsuw^(a)^*- Kaus. I 'add' (only PPt), ^A^*tspäṅk*- 'flay' (only PPt).

Uncertain cases are: *kau*- Kaus. IV 'let (?) kill' (Pt II/III); ^A^*yäsk^?^*- '?' (only PPt, Pt II/III); ^A^*sik^(a)^*- Antigv./Kaus. I 'make overflow' (only PPt, Pt II/III); *ṣärtt^?^*- 'incite' (only PPt, Pt II/III).

	TB	TA
1.sg.act.	*yātkawa*	*śaśmāwā, raritwā*
2.sg.act.	*yātkasta*	*śaśmāṣt*
3.sg.act.	*yātka*	*śaśäm, kakälypā-ṃ*
1.pl.act.	—	—
2.pl.act.	—	—
3.pl.act.	*yātkare, śānmyar-ne*	*śaśärsār*
1.sg.mid.	*caukamai*	*papälyke*
2.sg.mid.	*tsyālpatai*	—
3.sg.mid.	*caukate*	*papälykāt*
1.pl.mid.	*klyautkāmte* (sic)[1]	—
2.pl.mid.	—	—
3.pl.mid.	*caukante*	*śaśmānt*
PPt	*ceccuku/ ceccukoṣ*	*papälyku*

It is immediately apparent that the formation of the Class II preterit in the two languages differs. However, it is also apparent that both types synchronically have the same function, so that a joint discussion of both types is justified regardless of the question whether they reflect a common type diachronically.

In Tocharian A, the Pt II always shows reduplication, while in Tocharian B the Pt II never does. Both languages also have different attitudes with respect to palatalization of the root initial. On the one hand, they differ compared with each other, and on the other hand, there are both palatalized and unpalatalized forms to be found within each of the two languages. The accent of the Pt II in Tocharian B is another important case in point.

---

[1] For this form see the discussion of the accent below 8.2.

8.1.1. *Function*

The preterits of kausativa in both languages are usually provided by a Class II preterit formation, and for this reason the manuals call this class also "Kausativpräteritum" (cf. TEB I, 244, § 439). All four kinds of kausativum paradigms are found with Class II preterits, i.e., oppositional transitives (Kaus. I), causatives (Kaus. II and IV), and occasionally even Kaus. III. All of these four functions are also found with the other kind of "Kausativpräteritum", i.e., the Class IV preterit; note further that, to a certain extent, Class III can also function as preterit of oppositional transitives (i.e., antigrundverb formations; see chap. Pt III 9.1.7.). The choice between Pt II and Pt IV seems to depend on the root vocalism: the preterit of Class II is usually formed from roots showing non-full root vocalism (*ä, i, u*), while roots with full root vocalism (*ā, ai*/TA *e, au*/TA *o*) tend to form a kausativum preterit of Class IV instead, cf. TEB I, 244, § 439.[2]

---

[2] Exceptions are found with *[A]say-* 'satiate' and *spārtt[(a)]-/ [A]spārtw[(a)]-* Kaus. I 'turn', and most likely also with two other roots. The middle preterit *yātante* attested in THT 1250 is best taken at face value and therefore analyzed as a Pt II of *yāt[(a)]-* Kaus. II 'enable, tame' (standing beside expected and regular Pt IV forms); it is unlikely that this is a Pt I, because one would have to assume a misspelling for †*yatānte*, and a middle form would in addition be very unusual for the Pt I of a Prs IV verb like this. Finally, there is the PPt TA *worpu* from a root meaning 'surround' that possibly was *[A]wārp[(a)?]-*, as suggested by clearly cognate TB PPt *wawārpau*, and which also seems to imply a Pt II; note that there existed another root *[A]wārp[a?]-* denoting 'urge oneself', presupposed by the Pt I form TA *wārpat*. As for an explanation for these apparent exceptions, the 3.sg.act. preterit PT *yātā* may have started out as an instrumental 'with ability', and therefore may have originally denoted both 'was able' and 'made able, enabled'; in the latter meaning, however, it later, that is, in (pre-)TB times, could have been reanalyzed as a Pt II form, on account of its ambiguous root initial *y-*. As for the PPt TA *worpu*, TA quite possibly rather had a non-denominative = primary root *[A]wärp-*, since it would, even on account of TB *wawārpau*, be quite wrong to conclude that such a root could not have existed, cf. the parallel case of *[A]luk-* 'light up' standing beside TB PPt form **lalaukau* (presupposed by *lalaukarne*). As for *[A]say-* 'satiate', the PPt TA *sasyu* clearly started out as TA equivalent of the TB PPt *sosoyu*, which was obviously not a PPt to a Pt II, and the finite Pt II form TA *sasyā-* was more likely precisely a backformation based on that very PPt TA *sasyu*. As for 3.sg. TA *saspärtu*, this can easily be taken for an equivalent of TB *ṣpyārta*, having secondarily undergone depalatalization of the initial under the analogical influence of the respective Pt I.

In Tocharian A, both a preterit of Class II and one of Class III are occasionally attested from the same root without difference in meaning or function: e.g., from *A*sruk- 'kill', *A*pyutk- 'come into being' (cf. TEB I, 176, § 300,3). This is to be explained as a consequence of the fact that in Tocharian A the PT sk-presents of Class IX (belonging to the kausativum paradigms) merged with the PT s-presents of Class VIII (belonging to the antigrundverb paradigm).

8.1.2. *Endings*

The preterit of Class II in both languages usually exhibits the endings met within the Class I preterit, but owed to the fact that stem-final (*)-*ā*- is almost always preceded by a syllable consisting of an *ä*-vowel, there are hardly any instances of weakening by vowel balance in Tocharian A. Note that the PPts synchronically belonging to a Pt II lack stem-final PT *-*ā*-,[3] so that one can safely assume that the inflection in (*)-*ā(-)* seen in the finite forms was somehow secondary.

8.1.2.1. *The 1.sg. active*

The three attestations of a 1.sg. active in Tocharian A require a special discussion. Descriptively, we have -*ā* in TA *raritwā* from *A*ritw*(a)*- Kaus. I 'connect, etc.' and -*āwā* in TA *śaśmāwā-m* from *A*ṣtäm*(a)*- Kaus. I 'put'. The third example, 1.sg. TA *wotkā-ṃ* is a special and different case, because (as I think) due to an early contraction of the reduplication syllable with the root syllable the whole paradigm synchronically inflects like a Pt I (cf. Krause, 1955a, 138, fn. 8; Winter, 1965a, 207f. = 1984, 174f. = 2005, 132f., fn. 1; TEB I, 246f., § 441,2; see also below 8.1.3.1.). This leaves TA *śaśmāwā-m* clearly showing the analogical TA desinence variant -*āwā* otherwise also met in the TA imperfect and in the TA Pt IV. Of course, the fact that we only have -*ā* in TA *raritwā* will somehow be a consequence of the fact that the root ended in -*w*-, but it is impossible to tell exactly how PT *-twāwā in this form had finally turned into -*twā*, haplology being, of course, a quite likely assumption (as suggested by Krause, 1955a, 138, fn. 8; I fail to understand Winter, 1965a, 207f. = 1984, 174f. = 2005, 132f., fn.1, — probably he is there implicitly referring to his rule explicitly stated in

---

[3] As pointed out by Winter, 1994a, 299 = 2005, 480, although this puzzled him ("eine Erklärung hierfür läßt sich nicht geben"). For an explanation see below 8.1.6.

1965, 204 = 2005, 120, according to which unstressed PT *-wāwV turned into -wV).

8.1.2.2. *The 3.pl. active*

The 3.pl. active ending variant *-ar* in *śānmyar-ne* (THT 1507 a 4) is an informal variant more frequently attested in the Pt Classes I, IV, and V; see the respective chap.s and Peyrot, 2008, 135.

8.1.3. *Reduplication in Tocharian A*

The most remarkable fact about the reduplication seen in the TA finite Pt II forms is that there is overt reduplication at all. With the exception of some TA Pt IV forms,[4] no such reduplication can be found in any other historically attested finite verbal form of Tocharian. What is more, if it is correct to explain the persistent accent on the first syllable in many (mostly finite) TB verbal forms by deriving them from PT reduplicated forms that had reduplication syllables of the structure *Cä-, those TA finite Pt II forms are even more unexpected. On the other hand, overt reduplication is rather typical of PPts, and the reduplication vowel TA *-a-* met in the finite TA Pt II forms will certainly derive from the same PT vowel that underlies the reduplication vowel TA *-a-* seen in the TA PPts to Pt II formations, and which can only have been PT *æ judged by the evidence of the respective TB PPts, which all start with *Ce-*. Although PT *æ is itself highly problematic as a reduplication vowel of PPts, the obvious strategy will be to explain this TA reduplication vowel *-a-* as being taken over from, or showing analogical influence of, the respective PPts, as has actually already been done by Kim, 2003, 208. Bendahman, 1993, 233 (followed by Peters, 2004, 442, fn. 58) even went so far as to claim that "ausgehend vom redupl. Partizip, das seine *e*-Stufe in Toch. A nur von *ē*-Präterita [i.e., *lyāka*-type preterits] bezogen haben kann, ein neues redupl. Präteritum mit dem analogischen Wurzelvokal *e* im Indikativ gebildet wurde". However, I fail to see any plausible model that could have prompted such a creation of the TA finite Pt II forms *ex nihilo*, although I would agree that some of the finite TA Pt II forms were indeed backformations based on PPt forms

---

[4] Among the exceptions hardly belongs the unclear TB form *memyas* in 28 a 7 (pace Adams, 1993b, 35f.); see the discussion of this form s.v. *mi-* 'hurt, harm'.

formerly belonging to other preterit classes.[5] Kim's analysis is in my view backed by the evidence of the TA reduplicated finite forms of preterit Class IV, which, I think, should be explained by an analogical influence of the respective PPts as well.[6]

8.1.3.1.   *Roots beginning with yä° or wä°*

In roots beginning with *yä°* or *wä°* the reduplication syllable formed a diphthong with the analogically preserved or restored root initial when the root had a structure *y/wäC-*, with **yayC-* and **wawC-* finally turning into *yeC-* and *woC-* in cases where *C* was capable to form a syllable-initial cluster, viz. a consonant other than *-r-*, **-yr-* and **-wr-* (cf. Krause, 1955a, 138, fn. 8; Winter, 1965a, 207f. = 1984, 174f. = 2005, 132f., fn. 1; TEB I, 246f., § 441,2). Since forms such as the 3.pl.mid. TA *yetänt* from [A]*yät-* 'adorn' go back to pre-TA proto-forms starting with **ya-yäC-*, **wa-wäC-*, they quite expectedly do not show weakening by vowel balance. On the other hand, two roots of the structure *wäCC-* show *wo-* instead of a surface structure [†]*wawäCC-* that was to be expected on account of 3.sg. TA *wawik*, PPt *wawiku* from [A]*wik[(ä)]-* Kaus. II 'drive out' (since *-i-* went back to **-äy-*, of course, no syncope of **-ä-* in an open syllable could have occurred): 1.sg.act. TA *wotkä-ṃ*, 2.sg.act. TA *wotkaṣt* (not [†]*wotkāṣt*), 3.sg.act. TA *wotka-m*, 3.pl.act. TA *wotkar* from [A]*wätk[(ä)]-* Kaus. II 'command', and 3.sg.act.

---

[5] To be more precise, the only two TA PPts descriptively belonging to a Pt II that clearly lack lautgesetzlich root-initial palatalization, viz. TA *kakärnu* (found beside a 3.sg. TA *kakräṃ*) from [A]*kärn-* 'hit', and TA *sasyu* (attested beside a 3.sg. starting with *sasyā-*) from [A]*say-* 'satiate'. Both of them clearly form equations with TB PPts made from the respective TB roots that do not belong to a Pt II.

[6] As is argued in chap. Pt IV 10.2., reduplication of finite forms (that also have a syllable of the structure *Ca-*) is within the TA Pt IV restricted to stems starting with an initial *Cä-* structure. Such stems must have lacked any reduplication syllable already in (pre-)PT times, as amply argued in chap. Sub I/V 18.7.1.1.2. Accordingly, such stems originally must have lacked a reduplication syllable in both the PPt and the finite forms altogether; but on the other hand it is conceivable that precisely the respective PPts eventually acquired reduplication syllables of the structure *Ca-* by inter-paradigmatic analogy with the other PPts belonging to Pt Class IV that all had such reduplication syllables. Of course, there will first have been a period when in those PPts from stems with initial *Cä-* there was a mere variation of zero with *Ca-*, and this variation then could have spread secondarily to the respective finite forms.

TA *worta-ṃ*, 3.pl.act. TA *wortar* from ᴬ*wärt⁽ᵃ⁾ˀ-* 'throw'. These forms even show weakening of (*)*ā* by vowel balance.[7]

As for roots with initial TA *w-*, beside expected TA *wawik*, TA *wawiku*, and TA *wawru* from ᴬ*wär-* 'practice', and beside the expected *woC-* as seen in the 3.pl. TA *wotār*, and also beside the rather unexpected *woCC-*, we occasionally also find *waC-* and *waCC-* in PPts belonging to Pt II that show *wo-* in the finite forms. Here belong PPt TA *watu* beside the 3.pl. *wotār* and the finite Pt II stem TA *wotk-* from ᴬ*wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II 'command' where we find both a PPt TA *wotku* and a lexicalized TA *watku* meaning 'command'. On the other hand, the PPts from ablauting TA roots with initial TA *wä°* standing beside a Pt of Class III show exclusively TA *waC(C)-*: PPt TA *watku (in the Abs TA *watkuräṣ* 'having decided' in A 317 a 7) from ᴬ*wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'decide, etc.' beside Pt III; TA *walu* from ᴬ*wäl-* 'die' beside Pt III 3.sg. TA *wläs*; PPt TA *wasu* beside Pt III from ᴬ*wäs-* 'put on'; probably PPt TA *waltsu* from ᴬ*wälts?-* 'sum up' (only PPt); on the other hand, TA *wawu* from non-ablauting ᴬ*wä(s)?-* 'give' (beside 3.pl. Pt III TA *wäsr-äṃ*) clearly must have replaced an earlier non-reduplicated *wu from PT *wäwä.

Ringe, 1989a, 39f. also points out TA *woltsurākk* '(very) briefly' in A 237, 5 beside more often attested *waltsurā°*, which according to him may "reflect a late sporadic change of *wa* to *wo*". For an explanation of this divergence, see chap.s Sound Laws 1.6. and PPt 14.2.1.1.

8.1.4. *Accent in Tocharian B*

In Tocharian B, finite forms of preterit Class II do not conform to the regular accent rules but have persistently accent on the first syllable[8] with very few exceptions from non-MQ texts (cf. Kim, 2003, 198f. with fn. 17). These exceptions are: 3.sg.mid. *tsyālpāte* (Š) beside *tsyalpāte*

---

[7] Here apparently also belongs TA PPt *worpu* 'surrounded' as a PPt to a Pt II, although TB attests to a Pt I with the root vowel -*ā*- (*wawārpau*); see above fn. 2.

[8] Pinault, 1989, 149 proposed that in a Pt II form like *cālawa* the root vowel does not bear the accent, which would, however, imply that with respect to the use of ⟨ā⟩ and ⟨a⟩, the TB Pt II behaved completely differently from the other morphological categories, cf. Kim, 2003, 198, fn. 16. I follow the generally held view that a writing like *cālawa* indicates that the form synchronically had the accent on the root syllable.

(?) from *tsälp*[(a)]- Kaus. I 'separate', and 1.pl.mid. *klyautkāmte* (M) from *klutk*[(a)]- Kaus. I 'turn into'.

Kim, 2003, 199, fn. 17, who based his survey on the verbal list of WTG, in addition lists the 3.sg. Pt II *myārsā-ne* from *märs*[(a)]- Kaus. IV 'make forget' and the 3.pl. Pt II *śānmyāre* from *śänm*- 'bind' as similar exceptions, but these forms have to be left out. *śānmyāre* is said to be attested by WTG, 294 in a Paris text edited by Lévi/Meillet, 1912, 2; however, Lévi/Meillet there gave (the morphologically correct) *śānmyare*, which is indeed the correct reading, cf. now Pinault, 1989a, 156 (= PK AS 16.3 a 5). *myārsā-ne*, on the other hand, is attested in Br.Mus. 1 b 3, a manuscript not only showing MQ character but also archaic ductus (see Malzahn, 2007a, 268ff.), so it does not tell us anything about the accent.

As for *kly[au]tkā(m)t(e)* restored by Sieg/Siegling in the fragmentary passage 428 b 3, there is contradictory information available about the text provenance. The manuscript has the site mark signature "M 114", so we seem to have a text from Murtuq, i.e., from an eastern find spot. However, Couvreur, 1947a, 69, fn. 50a stated that *klyautkāmte* hails from Qizil, and he is, understandably, followed by Kim, 2003, 199, fn. 17. To be sure, some Berlin manuscripts with the find-spot signature 'M' indeed do not hail from Murtuq, but from the Kuča region, 'M' denoting 'Ming-öi', cf. Adaktylos et al., 2007, 41f. However, I doubt that this manuscript also belongs among these western manuscripts, because there is no indication on the original manuscript's label to support that view, and, what is more, the text 428 does not show MQ character otherwise, but rather what are typically informal forms (cf. the classification as a "late" text by Peyrot, 2008, 222). Accordingly, I guess that Couvreur's claim that this is an MQ form was just a mechanical one, because it precisely shows non-standard writing.

Finally, there are *tsyālpāte* (attested twice in the Šorčuq text 30 b 5 and in the MQ text 341 a 2), and *tsyalpāte* in H 150.104 b 3 (= IOL Toch 263; not listed in WTG). As for *tsyālpāte*, since a writing with two long -*ā*- vowels has to be an error in any case in a standard manuscript, I assume that the form is due to copying from an older manuscript with MQ characteristics (on such copying see basically Malzahn, 2007a, 286ff.), and the same may be true for *tsyalpāte* if this is not an MQ text itself (cf. Peyrot, 2008, 232, who classifies it as "archaic I" with question mark).

This leaves just the not entirely certain *klyautkā(m)t(e)* as possible exception from the initial-accent only rule, and this one form is certainly not diagnostic.

8.1.5. *Initial palatalization in Tocharian A and B*

Palatalization of the root-initial consonant is attested in both languages in both the finite Pt II and in the respective PPt. However, there are also forms lacking palatalization even though the root initial is palatalizable. Tocharian B has only one such exception,[9] in Tocharian A there are much more. In Tocharian B, there is the further problem that beside the regular outcomes of palatalized root initials we are also faced with what seem to be clusters consisting of a (mostly) non-palatal consonant and a following ⟨y⟩, which are usually taken for so-called "secondary" results of root-initial palatalization. What is even more confusing, the ordinary and the alleged "secondary" reflexes of palatalization can be found even with one and the same Pt II stem.

8.1.5.1. *Tocharian B*

All roots starting with simple *t°* show *c°* as palatalization product both in the finite Pt II and in the PPt (pace Hilmarsson, 1991, 140f., PPt *tetarkuwa* is better analyzed as a Pt III form); initial *l°* and *Cl°* turns into *(C)ly°*. Root-initial *r°*, *Cr°*, and *y°* remain unchanged. There are two different outcomes from roots beginning with simple *k°*, *n°*, and *w°*. In the case of *k°*, we find the ordinary palatal *ś°* beside *ky°*; in the case of *n°*, we have the ordinary palatal *ñ°* beside what may be called a super-palatal *ñy°*, and in the case of *w°*, we find ordinary *y°* beside *wy°*. In the case of *p°*, there is only one relevant form, which has *py°* instead of ordinary *p°*. Roots starting with *m°* are different again, as they show *my°* in all finite forms, but *m°* devoid of *-y-* in the respective participles (cf. 3.sg. *myāska*, but PPt *memisku* from *mäsk-* '(ex)change'; 1.sg. *myāyawa*, but PPt *memīyu* from *mi-* 'hurt'). As for roots starting with *sV°* and *st°*, we only find expected *ṣ°* and *ś(c)°*, respectively, but in the case of *sp°*, there are two different outcomes

---

[9] 3.pl. *kānare* in the Šorčuq text 42 a 8 which may, of course, just be a misspelling, but on the other hand, there are other forms pointing to a transitive stem *kānā-* which was just secondarily turned into *kyānā-* in analogy with other forms of the Pt II with surfacing *-y-* after the root initial (for *kānā-* see below 8.2.4.).

again, i.e., *ṣp°* and *ṣpy°*, with *ṣpy°* being confined to the finite Pt II. Finally, roots with initial *ts°* behave precisely like the roots with initial *m°* (and also similarly to the roots with initial *sp°*), showing *tsy°* in all of the finite forms, and non-palatal *ts°* in all PPt forms. Actually we have the following scheme:

k → ś	*k → ky*
kätk⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. IV	*kän⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I (MQ, Š, S)
kärs⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. IV (+ PPt)	*ku-* Kaus. III/IV (S)
käl ͣ- Kaus. IV	
kuk- (only PPt)	
kutk ͣˀ- Kaus. III/IV (only PPt)	
n → ñ	*n → ñy*
näm- Kaus. III (only PPt)	*närs-* (Š)
närk-	
nip-	
nu⁽ᵃ⁾-	
	p → py
	pälk- Kaus. I (S)
m → m	*m → my*
mäsk- (only PPt)	*mäsk-*
mi- (only PPt)	*mi-*
w → y	*w → wy*
wätk⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. II (+ PPt)	*wäks⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I
wär- (only PPt)	
wäl˒- (only PPt)	
wik⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. II (+ PPt)	
sp → sp	*sp → spy*
spänt⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I (only PPt)	*spärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II (MQ)
spārtt⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I (only PPt)	*spārtt⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I (Š)
ts → ts	*ts → tsy*
tsär⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I (only PPt)	*tsär⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I (MQ)
tsuw⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I (only PPt)	*tsälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I (MQ, Š)

Quite evidently, not only the PPts starting with *peṣp°*, but also the PPt *memisku* goes back to a proto-form with a root-initial palatalized consonant, witness its root vowel *-i-* (as noticed first by Schulze, 1924, 171f. = 1934, 246).

As for the origin of initial *ñy-*, *py-*, etc. met in Pt II forms, it was generally assumed that these clusters evolved somehow irregularly out from PT **n'-*, **p'-*, etc., and/or somehow analogically replaced the regular results of PT **n'-*, **p'-*, etc.,[10] which should, of course, have been TB *ñ-*, *p-*, etc. To be sure, until 2003 the details of this alleged

---

[10] See, e.g., J. Jasanoff apud Kim, 2003, 203, fn. 25.

development had remained rather unclear. Accordingly, Kim, 2003, esp. 203 (with an amendment in Kim, 2009, 31ff.) tried a completely different take on those *y*-clusters. According to him, *py-* etc. developed out of pre-TB sequences of the **p'äyV-* type. In order to get to such pre-TB sequences, he assumes that in pre-TB, what had been formerly reduplicated preterits of a structure **C$_i$(')ä-C$_i$'āC(C)-ā-* were analogically replaced by preterits with insertion of **-äy-* of the structure **C'-äy-āC(C)-ā-*, as a consequence of a reanalysis of originally reduplicated preterits of the **yä-yāC(C)-ā-* type (from roots starting with either **y-* or **w-*) as preterits with insertion of **-äy-* of the **y-äy-āC(C)-ā-* type.[11] Strangely enough, Kim claims that all of the historically attested finite Pt II forms (and even all of the respective PPt forms)[12] of Tocharian B derive from such analogical proto-forms with **-äy-* insertion, which simply does not work phonologically for many of the attested forms.[13] Actually, it would have made much more sense to assume that only the forms with the surfacing *y*-clusters resulted from such analogically reshaped ancestor forms. However, even if such an amendment is made, the analogical process Kim is forced to come up with is extremely implausible by itself and would lack any convincing parallel from other languages.[14]

---

[11] To be sure, Kim, 2003, 210 does not use the term "-äy- insertion" himself.

[12] Which means that, according to Kim, 2003, 215, e.g., PT **cæ-cäl-äwä* (a regular outcome of which he correctly states was TA *caclu*) was analogically reshaped into pre-TB **ce-cáyäl-äwä*; and this proto-form he claims had to develop by sound law into Late pre-TB **ce-cyál-äwä* and eventually TB "*ceccálu*".

[13] As occasionally admitted by Kim himself; see, e.g., Kim, 2003, 205, fn. 31; 215, fn. 52. To be brief, to judge from the overview on relevant regular sound changes assumed by himself in Kim, 2003, 206, by his own standards he is unable to explain any of the forms with initial *ky-, ñy-, wy-*; what is more, he cannot explain the presence of *ñy-* in some nominal forms that do not have to do with the verbal system, and he (implicitly) quite wrongly predicts the existence of forms with initial †(C)ry- such as †*tryaika*, whereas the only relevant forms attested are rather of the *traika* type, that is, roots starting with **(C)r-* lack Pt II forms with *y*-clusters completely. As for his take on the PPts as already mentioned in the preceding footnote, he seems to forget that PT **-äy/w'ä-* regularly developed into TB -*ĭ-*.

[14] As for the Sanskrit perfect-stem allomorphs of the *pet-* type referred to by Kim, 2003, 210f., of course, no scholar before Kim made the claim that the *pet*-type allomorphs resulted from earlier **payt*-type allomorphs triggered by a reanalysis of reduplicated **ya-ym-*, etc., as **yam-*, etc. with inserted **-y-*. All of the alleged parallels invoked by him clearly show analogical generalization

On the other hand, TB *ñy-* instead of expected bare *ñ-* as a reflex of PT **n'-* is also found in another word, viz. in the noun *ñyas* 'desire', where the cluster is to be explained as an outcome of PT **n'-* originally typical of the most elaborated styles only, but then also borrowed into the standard styles whenever their speakers for some reason wanted to prevent the palatalized nasal from being perceived as non-palatalized; see Malzahn, 2007, 239f. in detail. But if this is correct, then it would be only consistent to assume that PT **p'-*, **m'-*, **w'-*, and **ts'-* turned out as *py-*, *my-*, *wy-*, and *tsy-* in the lentissimo phono-styles of Tocharian B in a parallel way,[15] and could be borrowed into the standard styles in order to make sure that Pt II forms got perceived with a palatalized root initial, given that initial palatalization seems to have been a quite important morphonological marker of TB Pt II forms.[16]

Quite interestingly, the forms with *-y-*clusters are not confined to particular regions, although it is true that in absolute numbers, the *-y-*forms more often come from eastern texts (just like isolated kausativum *ā*-subjunctive *kyānamar*). To be sure, the 2.sg. *kyānasta* attested in the MQ text 224 b 1 may come from a manuscript in common archaic ductus, but this text already precisely shows some influence of the more progressive styles (cf. hypercorrect *onolmennai* for *onolmenne*). *ñyārsa-me* is attested in a text from Šorčuq, which at any rate goes well with the fact that with respect to the variant forms *ñyātse/ñātse* 'danger, adversity, plague, distress' and *ñyas/ñas* 'desire' one can state the *ñy*-forms occur in western and central texts, whereas the *ñ*-forms show up in eastern texts (see Malzahn, 2007, 239f.). *wyāksasta* in 204 b 2 is of unknown provenance, though the text shows recent monophthongization in *ekasta* in b 3.

---

of the *output of* sound change, whereas the analogical generalization he is pleading for would be one of a (possible) *input to* sound change.

[15] On the word-internal results of PT **w'äy-* > **w'-* see also chap. Pt VII 13.2. on the occasion of the Pt VII derived from the root *śāw-* 'live'.

[16] The PPts then evidently must be assumed to have escaped this borrowing, for being both more marginal and more conservative than the respective finite forms. Note that one may have expected PT **(C)r'-* to evolve into †(C)ry- within the lentissimo styles; the lack of TB finite Pt II forms with such an initial would then rather point to a development **(C)r'-* > *(C)r-* even within the most elaborated styles, and such an assumption would indeed fall well into line with the fact that in contrast to pre-PT **peC-* and **meC-*, pre-PT **(C)reC-* seems not to have resulted in a PT sequence of the structure **C(C)äyC-* (as per Melchert, 1978, 120).

8.1.5.2.   *Tocharian A*

Unlike Tocharian B, Tocharian A always shows the usual palatalization product of the consonant (cluster) if the Pt II is palatalized at all. The following table only lists roots with (possibly) palatalizable root initials. Note that in contrast to Tocharian B, *Cr-* groups like TA *tr-* and also TA *tp-* can become palatal.[17]

Non-palatalized:

ᴬkän- Kaus. I, *ᴬkärn-* (+ PPt), *ᴬkäl-*, *ᴬkäln-* Kaus. I, *ᴬkälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. IV, *ᴬkäl(t)sᵃ-* Kaus. IV, *ᴬkäs-* Kaus. IV, *ᴬtätk-*, *ᴬtrisk-* Kaus. I, *ᴬtrus-*, *ᴬsätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I, *ᴬsay-* (+ PPt), *ᴬspārtw⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I, *ᴬsruk-* (+ PPt).

Palatalized:

ᴬkätk⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. IV (only PPt), *kärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. IV (+ PPt), *ᴬtäp-* (only PPt), *ᴬtäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. III (+ PPt), *ᴬtpuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. ? (only PPt), *ᴬtränk-* Kaus. I (only PPt), *ᴬtrik⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II (only PPt), *ᴬnäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* (only PPt), *ᴬnärk-* (only PPt), *ᴬnu-*, (*ᴬpälk⁽ᵃ⁾²-* + PPt,)[18] *ᴬlänk-* Kaus. II (only PPt), *ᴬläm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I (+ PPt), *ᴬlitk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. III (only PPt), *ᴬluk-* Kaus. II (+ PPt), *ᴬlutk⁽ᵃ⁾²-* (+ PPt), *ᴬṣtäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I (+ PPt), *ᴬtspänk-* (only PPt), *ᴬtsäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I, *ᴬtsär⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I, *ᴬtsälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I (only PPt).

Note especially:

ᴬnätk⁽ᵃ⁾- (finite)	*ᴬnätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* (PPt)
ᴬspärk⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. II (finite)	*ᴬspärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II (PPt)

As can be gleaned from this list, PPts may even show palatalization when the respective finite forms do not. As a matter of fact, one can claim that originally, all TA PPts belonging to a Pt II were palatalized, since at least one of the TA regular outcomes of initial PT *sr'-* may quite well have been precisely *sr-*, and since *kakärnu* (found beside a 3.sg. TA *kakräṃ*) from *ᴬkärn-* 'hit', and TA *sasyu* (attested beside a 3.sg. starting with *sasyā-*) from *ᴬsay-* 'satiate' clearly started out as PPts belonging to preterits of another class than Class II, to judge from the respective TB PPts they can be equated with. As for the PPts having *wo-* instead of *wa-*, which would have been the lautgesetzlich

---

[17] The palatalization product of TA *tp°* and *tr°* is TA *cp-* and *cr-*. Note that these two clusters are only found in the PPt, but not in any finite preterit form, though this may just be a coincidence, since there are no such roots from which both a finite Pt II and a PPt are attested at the same time. Further, similarly structured TA *sr°* in *ᴬsruk-* shows both an unpalatalized finite Pt II and PPt.

[18] It is conceivable that the palatal root-*final lyk* indicates former palatalization of the root-initial *p'-.*

outcome of PT *w'æ-w'ä-, they are rather substitutes for older forms that indeed had initial *wa-*, as argued above 8.1.3.1.

Winter, 1980b, 559ff. = 1984, 252ff. = 2005, 246ff. (followed by Kim, 2009, 27ff.) compared the palatalized and non-palatalized TA preterits of Class II with corresponding Class I preterits made from the respective root (including cognate TB Pt I forms). In doing so, he came to the conclusion that both stem formations are correlated with respect to palatalization. However, there are both palatalized and non-palatalized Class I preterit stems to be found beside palatalized preterit II forms. A palatal Pt I beside a palatal Pt II is attested for: *[A]kätk[(a)]-*, *[A]kärs[(a)]-*, *[A]lyäm[(a)]-*, *[A]luk-*, *[A]ṣtäm[(a)]-*; a non-palatalized Pt I beside a palatal Pt II is found with: *[A]trik[(a)]-*, *[A]nu-*, *[A]litk[(a)]-*, *[A]tsäm[(a)]-*, *[A]tsär[(a)]-*, *[A]tsälp[(a)]-*; as for the rest of the palatalized Pts II, no respective Pt I form is attested.[19] Further, in the case of *[A]nätk[(a)]-* we find a consistently palatalized Class I preterit in Tocharian B (*ñätka*, *ñitkāre-ne*, even middle *ñätkatai*) beside an unpalatalized finite preterit II stem in Tocharian A. On the other hand, it is true that beside the non-palatalized Pt II forms from the roots *[A]sätk[(a)]-*, *[A]spārtw[(a)]-*, and *[A]spärk[(a)]-* there exist respective Pt I forms also lacking initial palatalization. Accordingly, the only conclusion to be drawn from this comparison is that quite possibly palatalized Pt II forms could occasionally undergo depalatalization owed to analogical influence from non-palatalized respective Pt I forms.

8.1.6. *Summary*

The historical evidence of Tocharian A strongly points to the existence of two different patterns for the finite verb forms in pre-Tocharian A, viz. both pre-TA *Cæ-CäC-ā- and *C'æ-C'äC-ā-, and the existence of only one single pattern for the respective PPts, viz. pre-TA *C'æ-C'äC-äwä. On the other hand, set aside the stem *k(y)ānā-*, the historical evidence of Tocharian B seems to attest to one single pre-TB pattern, viz. finite *C'āC-ā- (or, if one takes into account the initial accent, rather *C'ä-C'āC-ā-) vs. PPt *C'æ-C'äC-äwä.

---

[19] In accordance with his theory, Winter, l.c., proposed to read a palatalized Pt form *clava* in 584 a 9, but judging by the original manuscript this reading is excluded. I cannot find the listed Pt TB *klyutkā* (sic) "er wurde" anywhere in the published manuscripts (is it maybe due to a misreading of *klyautkā* //// in 428 b 3?); the form TA *śmā-m* belongs to *[A]ṣtäm[(a)]-* and not to *[A]tsäm[(a)]-*; see the discussion s.v. *[A]tsäm[(a)]-*.

Accordingly, one is led to assume that at least the PPt formations belonging to this class must have had a common ancestor in PT times, which makes the divergence in the finite preterit forms even more suspicious.

8.2.   DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

The diachronic explanations adduced so far basically differ with respect to whether one preferred to derive the Tocharian A and B types from one common PT type or from different sources.

8.2.1. *The causative aorist theory*

The reduplicated causative preterit of Tocharian A has, of course, often been compared with reduplicated so-called causative aorists of other IE languages, namely those of Greek and Vedic, and with the Latin reduplicated perfects of the type *totondī* as well; see Couvreur, 1938a, 96ff.; Pedersen, 1941, 174ff.; TEB, 244f., § 439; Adams, 1978, 282f.; 1988, 87; Pinault, 1989, 149. However, there are various problems with such an approach. The reduplicated aorists of Greek always show the zero grade of the respective root and almost always have thematic inflection; on the other hand, the Vedic reduplicated causative aorist is now mostly taken for an inner-Indo-Aryan innovation based on the Indo-Aryan outcome of the *imperfect* of the PIE reduplicated *present* $*\hat{g}i$-$\hat{g}enh_1$-ti; see, e.g., Jamison, 1983, 216ff. with ref., and Kim, 2003, 217ff. It is therefore virtually impossible to derive the TA Pt II from such a PIE category.[20]

For these reasons, Harðarson, 1997, 95ff. rather tried to derive the TA Pt II precisely from imperfect forms of the $*\hat{g}i$-$\hat{g}enh_1$-t type. But the problem with his approach is that he evidently could not account either for the finite forms of the Pt II found in Tocharian B or for the special shape of the respective PPt forms found in both languages. In addition, there is just one single root from which both a TA (and TB) Pt II and undoubtedly also a present of the type $*\hat{g}i$-$\hat{g}enh_1$-ti was formed in PIE times, viz. *kän⁽ä⁾-/ ^Akän-*, and precisely the Pt II made from this root lacks (at least ordinary) initial palatalization in both languages, which implies that precisely this Pt II could hardly have acted as a model for the whole type, which most often shows

---

[20] If I understand him correctly, Saito, 1998, 158ff., and 2006, 398 nevertheless wants to make precisely such a claim.

(ordinary) root-initial palatalization;[21] even worse, Pt II TA *kakäṃ* clearly could take on an *intransitive* meaning 'became', thereby pointing unambiguously to an origin as a perfect form.[22]

According to Beckwith, 1996, 176, fn. 5, Pt II stems such as "*k'ə-k'ərs-*" arose just by a special kind of inner-Tocharian proportional analogy, but the alleged analogical proportion he sets up is not really one at all.

8.2.2. *The dereduplication theory for Tocharian B*

A common origin of the reduplicated TA and the unreduplicated TB Class II preterit was at first proposed by Schulze, 1924 = 1934, 239ff. Schulze compared the coexistence of reduplicated and unreduplicated preterits made from the same root in Germanic such as Go. *haihait* vs. ON *hēt*, etc., by claiming the Northwest Germanic forms to be former reduplicated ones that underwent contraction as a consequence of dissimilatory loss of the root-initial consonant.[23] Schulze's approach met the favor of many other scholars; see the list in Kim, 2003, 196. If one is willing to assume the former presence of an additional syllable, one gets, of course, also a neat explanation for the persistent initial accent found with the finite TB Pt II forms. Note, however, that the alleged parallel from Germanic is quite doubtful (see, e.g., the alternative scenario advocated by Jasanoff, 2007), and so is Schulze's assumption that the respective PPts had started out as forms with a morphologically highly doubtful double reduplication.

For this reason, Kim, 2003, esp. 200ff. and 2009, 30ff. proposed a rather heavily modified version of Schulze's take on Pt II. Like Schulze he assumes a common (PT) origin of the TA and TB types of Pt II; as for the PIE origins, he does not really differ from Harðarson and similarly starts with inherited reduplicated stems of the shape "*Ce-Ce(R)C- or *Ci-Ce(R)C-". But differently from Harðarson, he explicitly

---

[21] It would be rather absurd to claim that the Pt II from [A]*kän-* had undergone secondary depalatalization under the influence of the Pt III attested only by the PPt TB *kekenu*/ TA *kaknu*, since there are no finite Pt III forms, and the respective (intrans.) finite forms are precisely provided by the Pt II made from this root.

[22] Since Kim, 2003, 217, 225 rather seems to share Harðarson's views about the PIE origins of TA Pt II, the latter objections raised against Harðarson will also apply to the respective views of Kim.

[23] Schulze proposed to explain the preservation of reduplication in the PPt by assuming a double reduplication of the type *papapyutku.

claims that such structures could also have resulted in the Pt II of Tocharian B, by assuming that evidently still in PT times, these reduplicated preterits first developed root allomorphs of the shape PT *-Cæ(R)C- in the active plural forms (scil. on the model of those Pt I paradigms that showed a root shape PT *C(')ä(R)C- in the active singular and precisely a root shape PT *Cæ(R)C- in the active plural), then generalized root-initial palatalization through the whole active paradigm (in contrast to what the respective Pt I paradigms did), and in the end generalized the root allomorph of the active plural forms *-C'æ(R)C- through the whole paradigm (again in contrast to what the respective Pt I paradigms did). To put it mildly, probably not too many people would like to predict a chain of analogical levelings like that one. As for the existence of non-palatalized Pt II forms in Tocharian A, Kim in 2003 assumed again different kinds of intra-paradigmatic analogical levelings, with an alleged archaic form TA *lalyutäk* 'made (happen)' (with a non-palatalized initial of the reduplication syllable and a palatalized root initial) playing a crucial part in the argument,[24] but since then Kim has changed his view in this respect, with the result that according to Kim, 2009, 37 the divergence is rather to be explained by inter-paradigmatic analogy than by intra-paradigmatic analogy.[25]

8.2.3. *The long-vowel preterit theory and the type TA lyāk, TB lyāka*

An alternative approach for the TB Class II preterit only was first proposed by Lane, 1948, 307f.; 1953a, 49ff. He did not connect the formation of the non-reduplicated TB preterit II with that of the reduplicated TA preterit II, but rather with the full-vowel TA imperfects of the type TA *lyāk* 'saw' (and also consequently with the

---

[24] To be sure, I cannot find a form TA *lalyutäk* in any of the manuscripts published so far, and TEB 1, 244, § 439ff., on which Kim's list of examples is based (p. 190ff.), correctly quotes TA *lyalyutäk*, which is the only respective form attested to my knowledge.

[25] "The presence or absence of initial palatalization in causative preterites is ... not only synchronically, but also historically connected to the form of the corresponding non-causative preterite: if the latter exhibits initial palatalization in the act. sg., so does the Cl. II preterite; but if the root forms a nonpalatalized Cl. I preterite, or only a Cl. III preterite, the TA Cl. II preterite lacks initial palatalization"; as already pointed out above in 8.1.5.2., this is incorrect.

TB preterit of Class I *lyāka* 'saw'),[26] further seeing these forms as cognates of the long-vocalic preterits of Latin and Germanic like Lat. *lēgī* 'read', Go. *berum* 'bore', etc.; see the detailed discussion in chap. Pt I 7.3.7. This view was followed by Adams, 1978, 282; 1988a, 87f.; 1993b; Pinault, 1989, 149; 2008, 600, both of them opposing to Schulze's idea of a contraction.

This theory, of course, implies that in pre-Tocharian B the pre-PT *ē*-grade preterit type could either function as Pt I, or as Pt II, the only difference being constituted by the accent. Consequently, Adams, 1993b, 37, fn. 2 proposed that the initial accent of the Pt II is only due to a secondary marking as causative. See also Bendahman, 1993, 223; Jasanoff, 1998, 305, fn. 24 and the discussion in chap. Pt I 7.3.7. On the other hand, Kim, 2003, 200 objected to this theory because of the persistent initial accent of the finite TB forms and also because in his view it "fails to account for the secondary palatalization of forms such as *pyalka* or *tsyāra*"; but there is nothing wrong with assuming a secondary accent shift to the left in a member of a kausativum paradigm, and the -*y*-cluster phenomenon has been accounted for quite differently above.

The problem with such an accent-shift-only theory is rather that it would leave the Pt II of Tocharian A unexplained, and that the Class Pt II would in that case be the only kind of preterit lacking a common PT ancestor formation. On the other hand, especially the fact that the TB *lyāka*-type Pt I and the TB Pt II share the same kind of PPt structure militates most strongly in favor of an ultimately common origin of the two formations; but then the two share their PPt structure also with the Pt II of Tocharian A.

8.2.4. *Conclusions*

As already suggested above and argued more detailedly in chap. Pt I 7.3.7., in my view the Pt II of Tocharian B is indeed best explained as a modification of the *lyāka*-type preterit as claimed by scholars such as Adams, Bendahman, and Jasanoff. If one assumes that only the accent was shifted analogically onto the initial syllable, one would, of course, not be able to derive both the TB kind of Pt II and the TA kind of Pt II from a common basis. However, deriving both formations from a common source would, in my opinion, be much more preferable, since

---

[26] The equation of the TA imperfect 3.sg. *lyāk* 'was seeing' with the TB preterit *lyāka* 'saw' actually goes back to TG, 385, fn. 1.

all the other preterit classes and, moreover, all the other members of the kausativum paradigms of both Tocharian languages, i.e., the present, subjunctive, and imperative formations, seem indeed to have originated in proto-forms of PT date, and since the Pt II of Tocharian A still lacks a plausible derivation. .

Therefore, I propose (a bit similarly to Beckwith, 1996, 176, fn. 5) that one should start with analogically reduplicated *lyāka*-type forms for both languages, the pivotal forms having probably been PT *st'ä-st'æmā, etc. and *k'ä-k'ærsā, etc. Such proto-forms would have led (more or less) by sound law to TB 1.sg. *śćäśćāmawa/śāmawa, 3.sg. *śćäśćāma/śāma and 1.sg. śārsawa, 3.sg. śārsa. Now, TA 1.sg. śaśmāwā, 3.sg. śaśäm do not look very far away from the ideal TB forms *śćäśćāmawa, *śćäśćāma from the root *stäm*[(a)]-; actually the 1.sg. (and also all other forms of the indicative paradigm with the exception of the 3.sg. active, as correctly seen by Kim, 2003, 202), could be traced back to ancestral forms starting with *st'æ-st'æmā-, which is very close to the PT *st'ä-st'æmā- reconstructed for Tocharian B above. Accordingly, there is just one single additional change to be assumed in order to get all the historically attested forms of Tocharian A, and this would be an analogical reshaping of *st'ä-st'æmā-, etc. under the influence of the reduplicated PPt *st'æst'ämäwä (> TA śaśmu) into *st'æst'ämā- (or maybe at least first just into *st'æst'æmā-; then also paradigmatic leveling could have led to the correct results, as suggested by Kim, 2003, 202f.). As for the two Pt II forms of Tocharian A that show weakening by vowel balance, i.e., 2.sg. TA wotkaṣt, etc. from *[A]wätk*[(a)]- Kaus. II 'command' and 3.sg. TA worta-ṃ, etc. from *[A]wärt*[(a)?]- 'throw', I then would like to suggest that they show the lautgesetzlich outcome of still unreshaped *w'äw'æ-, assuming that PT *-äw(')æ- contracted by sound law into TA/TB -o- so early that (1) the subsequent reshaping process for Pt II indicative forms that turned former *C'äC'æ- structures into *C'æC'æ- and eventually/or *C'æC'ä- structures could not apply any more, and (2) the resulting stems *wotkā- and *wortā- became subject to weakening by vowel balance much in the same way as all the stems in -ā- that had been disyllabic since even much earlier times.

As for the non-palatalized forms of the type TA kakäṃ, it is obvious that at least some of them must have undergone secondary depalatalization, because in some cases we still find a palatalized PPt coexisting with non-palatalized indicative forms, and non-finite forms as a rule tend to be less innovative than finite forms. Note also with regard to the Pt II TA nanätkāt as opposed to PPt TA ñañitku (2.sg.

ñätkatai, etc.; see chap. Pt I 7.3.6.), the lack of palatalization in *ᴬᴮnätk-* must be due to analogical depalatalization in any case. As the ultimate source for this tendency I suggest precisely the Pt II *kakäṃ* from *ᴬkän-* 'come about, occur', because the Pt II from its TB equivalent is certainly best assumed to have lacked palatalization at an earlier stage of development and to have started out as a reduplicated (!) Pt I of the shape PT *käkæ/ānā-.[27] In Tocharian A itself, the Pt II made from *ᴬkän-* also behaves irregularly, both semantically (intransitive TA *kakäṃ* 'became') and morphologically, scil. with respect to the imperative formation, because instead of a Class II imperative, we have a 2.sg. active form TA *pkanā-ñi*, which descriptively has to be assigned either to Class III or to Class I. Note further that more than half of the clearly non-palatalized TA Pt II forms are built from roots starting precisely with a *k°*, i.e., most[28] of the six other TA Pt II with non-palatalized root-initial *k°* may have simply been formed on the model of TA *kakäṃ*. As for the other TA Pt II forms apparently lacking initial palatalization, PT *tr'- and PT *sr'- may have turned into pre-TA *t'r- and *s'r- instead of pre-TA *tr- and *sr- just sporadically, and the Pt II forms from *ᴬsay-* 'satiate' are no doubt to explained in the same way as those from *ᴬkärn-* 'hit'.[29] This leaves finite forms from the five roots *ᴬtätk-*, *ᴬsätk⁽ᵃ⁾-*, *ᴬspārtw⁽ᵃ⁾-*, *ᴬnätk⁽ᵃ⁾-*, and *ᴬspärk⁽ᵃ⁾-*. As for the latter two roots, the respective PPts still show palatalization, so that it is obvious that in their cases secondary depalatalization must have occurred in the finite forms; since three of these five roots (*ᴬsätk⁽ᵃ⁾-*, *ᴬspārtw⁽ᵃ⁾-*, and *ᴬspärk⁽ᵃ⁾-*) are known to have formed a Pt I lacking root-initial palatalization, the obvious assumption is that the finite Pt II forms from these three roots were depalatalized precisely under the analogical influence of their respective Pt I forms, and that *ᴬnätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* (and maybe also *ᴬtätk-*)[30] finally followed the model of rhyming *ᴬsätk⁽ᵃ⁾-*.

---

[27] Cf. the various irregular forms from this TB root as pointed out in the verbal index s.v. *kän⁽ᵃ⁾-*.

[28] The PPt TA *kakärnu* from *ᴬkärn-* 'hit' I think rather started out as a PPt to a Pt III (as did its equivalent in Tocharian B), and the 3.sg. TA *kakräṃ* I take for a backformation to TA *kakärnu*.

[29] That is, TA *sasyu* did not start out as a PPt to a Pt II (as evidenced by its equivalent TB *sosoyu*), and the 3.sg.act. TA *sasyā-* is to be taken for a backformation to the PPt TA *sasyu* itself.

[30] This root is so poorly attested that one cannot exclude at all that there also existed a Pt I from it, which then also may have lacked initial palatalization.

THE *s*-PRETERIT — CLASS III

9.1.   SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRETERIT CLASS III

A preterit of Class III is formed from 97 verbs with certainty (73 in TB, 59 in TA, 35 TB = TA; only PPt attested: 18 TB, 13 TA, 1 TB = TA):

ᴬākl- 'teach, learn' (only PPt), *ār⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'leave', *āl⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv./ *ᴬāl⁽ᵃ⁾ʔ-* 'keep away, hold in check' (TB only PPt), *ās⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'dry out (itr)' (only PPt)/ *ᴬās⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. '(make ?) dry', *eṅk-/ ᴬeṃts⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'seize' (TA I + III), *er-/ ᴬar-* 'evoke', *aik-* 'know', *aip-/ ᴬep-* 'cover', *au-n-/ ᴬo(-n)-* 'hit, begin', *aul-* '± throw' (only PPt), *ᴬkatw-* 'ridicule' (only PPt), *kän⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'come about' (only PPt), *käm-/ ᴬkum-* 'come' (TA only PPt), *kärkʔ-/ ᴬkärk-* 'bind' (TB only PPt), *kärtkʔ-* '± decay' (only PPt), *kärnʔ-* 'hit' (only PPt), *käl-* 'bear', *käln-* 'resound', *käs-* 'extinguish, come to extinction', *ku-/ ᴬku-* 'pour', *ᴬkur⁽ᵃ⁾ʔ-* Antigv. 'make aged' (only PPt), *kau-/ ᴬko-* 'destroy', *ᴬkñas-* 'know', *krämp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'disturb', *kläṅk-* 'doubt' (only PPt), *kli-n-* 'be obliged to', *ᴬcämp-* 'be able to', *tās-/ ᴬtā(-s)-* 'put, place oneself' (TB I + III), *täk-* 'touch', *täṅk-/ ᴬtäṅk-* 'hinder' (TB only PPt), *täm-* 'be born', *tärk-* '± twine'/ *ᴬtärk-* '± lose (one's consciousness)' (TB only PPt), *trik⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv./ *ᴬtrik⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'miss, fail, lead astray', *treṅk-/ ᴬträṅk-* 'cling', *nāk-/ ᴬnāk-* 'blame', *näk-/ ᴬnäk-* 'destroy, lose, fall into ruin', *näm-/ ᴬnäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'bend, bow' (TA only PPt), *nusk-* 'squeeze', *päk-* 'cook, ripen' (only PPt), *pättʔ-* '± climb' (only PPt), *pärk-/ ᴬpärk-* 'ask', *ᴬpärsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be afraid', *ᴬpäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'extinguish', *pälk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'burn', *putk-* 'shut' (only PPt), *pyāk-* 'strike', *ᴬpyutk-* 'come into being, establish', *prākʔ-* '± fix' (only PPt), *plāk-/ ᴬplāk-* mid. 'ask for permission', *pläṅk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'sell', *plätk-/ ᴬplätk-* 'overflow, swell' (TA only PPt), *plu-* 'float', *ᴬplutk-* '± (a)rise', *ᴬmärk-* 'besmirch', *mä(s)ʔ-* 'go' (Pt I + III), *ᴬmäsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be', *mit⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬmitʔ-* 'set out', *mil-* 'wound' (only PPt), *mlutkᵃ̊-* Antigv. 'take off', *yāt⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'tame', *ᴬyām-* 'do', *yäp-/ ᴬyäw-* 'enter', *yänm⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬyom⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'achieve', *ᴬyärk-* 'honor', *yärp-* 'take care', *räk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv./ *ᴬräkʔ-* 'extend', *räṅk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'ascend', *ᴬrätʔ-* '?' (only PPt), *ᴬrätkʔ-* '± raise' (only PPt), *ri-n-/ ᴬri(-n)-* 'leave', *ru-* 'open' (only PPt), *ᴬläṅk-* Antigv. 'let dangle' (only PPt), *litk⁽ᵃ⁾ʔ-* 'remove', *ᴬlip⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'leave', *liy⁽ᵃ⁾ʔ-* '± wipe away' (only PPt), *luk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. act. 'illuminate', mid. 'light up, be illuminated'/ *ᴬluk-* Antigv. 'illuminate', *ᴬlutk⁽ᵃ⁾ʔ-* 'turn into', *lut-(/ ᴬlut-)* 'remove' (TA only PPt; Pt II/III), *ᴬwāk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'split', *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv./ *ᴬwätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'separate', *ᴬwäl-* 'die', *wältsʔ-/ ᴬwältsʔ-* 'sum up' (only PPt), *wäs-/ ᴬwäs-* 'don, wear', *wä(s)ʔ-/ ᴬwä(s)ʔ-* 'give' (Pt I + III), *ᴬwi⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be frightened', *ᴬwik⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'avoid'

(only PPt), *ṣärp-* 'indicate', *sätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'spread', *si-n-/ ᴬsi-n-* 'satiate', *sai-n-/ ᴬse-* 'lean on' (TA only PPt), *ᴬspärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'get lost', *ᴬsruk-* 'kill', *tsāk-/ ᴬtsāk-* 'glow', *tsäk-* 'burn', *tsäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'cause to grow', *tsärk-* 'burn' (only PPt), *tsuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. '± suckle, foster'.

Uncertain cases are: *kau-* Kaus. IV 'let (?) kill' (Pt II/III), *tinᵃ-* 'defile oneself' (only PPt, Pt I/III), *pruk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'ignore' (only PPt; see chap. Pt VII and PPt 14.1.1.1.), *ᴬyäsk²-* '?' (only PPt, Pt II/III), *ᴬwek²-* 'tell lies' (only PPt, Pt I/III), *ṣärp²-* 'beat' (Pt I/III), *ṣärtt²-* 'incite' (only PPt, Pt II/III), *ᴬsik⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv./Kaus. I 'make overflow' (only PPt, Pt II/III), *snätk²-* 'infuse' (only PPt, Pt ?).

	TB	TA
1.sg.act.	*nekwa, prekuwa*	*yāmwā, campu*
2.sg.act.	*nekasta*	*yāmäṣt*
3.sg.act.	*neksa*	*yāmäs, spärksā-m*
1.pl.act.	*maitam*	*wälmäs*
2.pl.act.	*maitas, lautso*	—
3.pl.act	*maitar*	*yāmär, yāmr-äṃ*
1.sg.mid.	*eṅksamai*	*rise*
2.sg.mid.	*eṅsatai*	*risāte*
3.sg.mid.	*eṅksate*	*risāt*
1.pl.mid.	*eṅksamte*	*naksāmät*
2.pl.mid.	—	*yāmtsāc*
3.pl.mid.	*eṅsante*	*risānt*
PPt	*eṅku/ eṅkoṣ*	*yāmu, raryu*

The most striking features of the *s*-preterit are the lack of the suffix *-s-* in the active stem with the exception of the 3. singular, and the accent pattern to be observed in Tocharian B. On the *t*-insertion between root-final consonants and *-s-*, see Zimmer, 1986, 87f. with ref. According to him, Tocharian B usually shows *-NsV̆-* turning into *-NtsV-*, while *-NsV̄-* is preserved; no rule can be found for Toch. A.

9.1.1. *Accent in Tocharian B*

Tocharian B shows the following accent pattern (demonstrated by the root *pärk-* 'ask'; not attested but reconstructable forms of its paradigm are indicated by *):

1.sg.act.	*prékwa*, prekúwa*	1.sg.mid.	*párksamai*
2.sg.act.	*prekǎsta* *	2.sg.mid.	*párksatai* *
3.sg.act.	*préksa, préksa-ne*	3.sg.mid.	*párksate* *

1.pl.act.	*prekä́m**	1.pl.mid.	*pä́rksamnte**
2.pl.act.	*prekä́s*, prékso**	2.pl.mid.	*pä́rksat**
3.pl.act	*prekä́r*	3.pl.mid.	*pä́rksante*

For the accent pattern I basically follow Winter, 1993, 197ff. = 2005, 441ff., who argued that the *s*-preterit formerly had a PT vowel *ä between the root and the endings and, respectively, between the root and the *s*-suffix, and that this *ä, which he evidently regarded as mere prop vowel,[1] in accordance with the basic accentuation rule of historical Tocharian B persistently bore the accent in pre-TB times. Winter has further shown that what was even to be expected an accented *á in pre-TB times had to be lost in open syllables before a non-sonorant dental consonant, which implies that pre-TB *á was also bound to be lost in front of the suffixal *-sā- found in Pt III.[2] However, as also shown by Winter, *á was retained in cases where by its loss the results would have been consonant clusters difficult to pronounce; hence, we have the 3.sg.act. *yonmasa* (metrical) from *yänm*[(a)]- 'achieve', 3.sg.act. *otkasa-me* (prose or metrical) from *wätk*[(a)]- 'separate', 3.sg.act. *mlautkasa*, and 1.sg.mid. *sätkasamai* (metrical). By this scenario, Winter is also able to explain the lack of weakening by vowel balance in Tocharian A, e.g., in TA *yāmtsāt*, which he plausibly declares to be the regular result of a four-syllable proto-form *yām-äsā-tæ. According to Winter, we have to set up the following proto-forms for pre-Tocharian B:

1.sg.act.	*præk-ä́-wā	*prékwa*, prekúwa*
2.sg.act.	*præk-ä́-stā	*prekä́sta**
3.sg.act.	*præk-ä́-sā	*préksa*
	*præk-ä́-sā-næ	*préksa-ne*
1.pl.act.	*præk-ä́-mä	*prekä́m**
2.pl.act.	*præk-ä́-sä	*prekä́s*, prékso**
3.pl.act	*præk-ä́-rä	*prekä́r*

---

[1] Between the end of a verbal stem ending in a non-syllabic and a verbal ending starting with a non-syllabic, a prop vowel *ä indeed must have developed already very early, probably still in pre-PT times; such an *ä (> *u after labials) is otherwise regularly found in Prs I and Sub I forms, and also in the PPts.

[2] Somewhat similarly Adams, 1994, who in addition claimed that *-äs- derived from PIE *-is-; see also the further speculations by Adams, 1997, 5ff. about an originally different accentuation pattern of Pt III paradigms.

1.sg.mid.	*präk-ä́-sā-may	*párksamai**
2.sg.mid.	*präk-ä́-sā-tay	*párksatai**
3.sg.mid.	*präk-ä́-sā-tæ	*párksate**
1.pl.mid.	*präk-ä́-sā-mätæ	*párksamte**
2.pl.mid.	*präk-ä́-sā-tä	*párksat**
3.pl.mid.	*präk-ä́-sā-ntæ	*párksante*

Winter did not discuss the 1.sg. active, although loss of the *ä́ is not expected here. However, *ä́ is indeed still reflected as expected in some 1.sg. active forms showing the ending variant *-uwa*, which was identified by Schmidt, 1985, 433f. as "ältere Vorform" of the 1.sg.act. *s*-preterit ending. This variant is attested in *ñauskuwa* (MQ) from *nusk-* 'squeeze', *prekuwa* from *pärk-* 'ask', and *pleṅkuwa* from *pläṅk*[(@)]- Antigv. 'sell'. Note that with the exception of the MQ form *ñauskuwa*, which is attested in the metrical passage 228 b 2f. in a manuscript with late common archaic ductus, the other instances are neither found in metrical passages nor in MQ texts. On the contrary, both attestations of *pleṅkuwa* come from business documents, i.e., informal-style texts, and *prekuwa* in the ordination text KVāc 24 a 5 can also be interpreted as an informal-style form.[3]

Some middle *s*-preterits do not show initial (surface) accent, but synchronically bear the accent on the suffix *-sā-*. Actually, the following Pt III paradigms are concerned:

käl- 'bear, endure' with 2.sg. *kelasta*, 3.sg. *keltsa*, 1.sg.mid. *kälsāmai*; *käln-* 'resound' with 3.sg.mid. *kälnsāte*; *tās-* act. 'put', mid. 'place oneself' with 3.sg. *tessa/tesa*, 3.pl. *tesar/tesare*, 3.sg.mid. *tässāte*, 3.pl.mid. *tässānte* beside (synchronically Pt I) 1.sg.mid. *tasāmai*, 2.sg.mid. *tasātai*, 3.sg.mid. *tasāte*, 3.pl.mid. *tasānte*; *wäs-* 'don' with 2.sg.mid. *wäsātai*, 3.sg.mid. *wässāte*.

The 1.sg.mid. *kälsāmai* is attested just once, in PK AS 13I a 7, a text of unknown provenance, but most likely from a western site; the 3.sg.mid. *kälnsāte* is found twice, the provenance of both texts being unknown (for the reading, see the discussion s.v. *käln-* 'resound'); 3.sg.mid. *tässāte*, 3.pl.mid. *tässānte* are attested a couple of times in texts written in all TB varieties; the Pt III forms of *wäs-* 'don' show

---

[3] Note that there are also other cases of (arguably) archaic features showing up in both archaic, MQ-feature texts and informal-style texts, but (usually) not in standard Tocharian (prose) texts such as the use of *o* mobile; see Malzahn, 2007a, 282ff.

suffix accent in all attestations, although beside the expected 2.sg.mid. *wäsātai* there is also *wasātai* attested a couple of times (!) in KVāc 12 (a western text); however, I assume that *wasātai* is merely due to erroneous omission of the *ä*-dots, and does not attest to either initial accent or a root vowel PT *æ*.

As for an explanation of these forms, I think *wäsāte* is a quite old form, attesting to a very early simplification of *-s(ä)s-[4] in the same way as the seeming Prs II (< Prs VIII) *keṣäṃ*,[5] and that *wässāte* is simply a secondarily reshaped variant of it, so that the accentuation of *wäs(s)āte* is perfectly regular. As for *tässā(n)te*, I suggest in a parallel way that it replaced an earlier form with one single *-s-, which, of course, would precisely be expected to have accent on the second syllable as well.[6]

Of course, such an explanation cannot be applied to *kälsāmai* and *kälnsāte*. As for these two forms, one may venture the guess that they were coined only very recently, and for that reason simply followed the model of the, no doubt quite frequent, middle Pt III forms from *tās-*; note that from the two respective roots no other middle form is attested so far.

Note furthermore the following two middle Pt III paradigms, which also offer some remarkable forms: *nāk-* 'blame' with 3.sg.mid. *nāksate/naksate*, 3.pl.mid. *nāksante/naksante*; *ri-n-* 'leave, give up' with 1.sg.mid. *rintsamai*, 2.sg.mid. *rintsatai/rinsatai*, 3.sg.mid. *rintsate*

---

[4] Note that TA also only attests to pre-TA *wäsā- by Pt III (reinterpreted as Pt I) *wse*, *wsānt* and the respective Sub V at least presupposed by TA *wsāl* 'garment'; however, *-ss- after a syllable with *ä as syllable peak may have undergone degemination in TA.

[5] As per Jasanoff, 1998, 314, fn. 53; 2003, 200; 2008, 159. As a consequence of this early degemination rule, roots of the *käs-* type first must have had Pt III paradigms with one single surfacing *-s-* showing up in all forms (i.e., forms such as 3.sg.act. TB **kesa*), and precisely on their model, I think, in Pt III paradigms from monosyllabic roots ending in a vowel (such as PT *cæ-/*tā-/ *tä- > TB *tās-*, TA *tā(s)-* 'put, set, place') the non-root-final single *-s-* of the 3.sg.act. and the middle forms (such as TB *tesa*, *tasāte*, TA *tse*, *tsāte*, *tsānt*) could have spread through the whole paradigm (leading to forms such as TB *tesar(e)*, TA *casär*); finally, as a consequence of another kind of inter-paradigmatic analogy, TB **kesa*, TB *tesa*, and TB *tasāte*-type forms could be replaced by forms of the *kessa*, *tessa*, and *tässāte* types (*tessa* actually being already attested in our earliest texts, e.g., in 220).

[6] Cf. TA *tse*, *tsāte*, *tsānt* and furthermore TB *tasāmai*, *tasātai*, *tasāte*, *tasānte*, all with just one single *-s-*; for the general framework, see the preceding footnote. Quite differently, Winter, 1993, 201 = 2005, 445.

(Š)/*rinsāte-ne* (Š), 1.pl.mid. *rīntsāmte* (MQ), 3.pl.mid. *rintsante*. As for *rinsāte-ne*, attested once in 88 b 4 (Š) beside many attestations of initial-accent forms, I propose that it does not attest to initial accent at all, but is due to a copyist's error, i.e., that the form was copied from a manuscript with MQ character.[7] *nāk-* 'blame' is a different case. The *nāk-* forms come from texts of all provenances; on the one hand, the *nāk-* forms also seem to be attested more often. It has to be pointed out that in the respective *s*-presents of Class VIII we similarly find: 3.sg.mid. *nakṣtär* (Š) beside *nākṣtär* (MQ), and, strangely enough, also 3.pl.mid. *nāksentär* beside expected *naksentär*. If it is correct that *nāk-* goes back to a PIE *ō*-grade **nōk̂-* made from the PIE root **√nek̂* 'destroy; perish' (as per Peters, 2004, 434, fn. 24), the middle forms with *nak-* can easily be derived from morphologically by far more regular (PIE > pre-PT) *e*-grade forms, with PT **n'äk-* eventually having been depalatalized under the influence of *nāk-*. This scenario would, of course, not explain *nāksentär* immediately; this form then is possibly best taken for a hypercorrect one that was triggered by the general variation of *nāk-* and *nak-* in other forms of the paradigm.

Other examples that have been adduced so far in favor of suffix accent because of the writing ⟨sā⟩ are not diagnostic, because they all come from texts with MQ character, such as is the case with 3.sg.mid. *lauksāte* (St. 42.2.1 = IOL Toch 285, MQ character, archaic ductus).

Thanks to the new insights into the accentuation pattern of Pt III and its origins owed to Winter and Adams, the speculations by Marggraf, 1970, 33ff. and Hilmarsson, 1991, 80f. concerning a connection of (*recte* non-)persistent accent in Pt III and persistent accent in Sub I can now be said to lack any basis.

9.1.2. *Endings*

9.1.2.1.   *The 1.sg. active*

The TB ending variant *-uwa* of the 1.sg. active shows preservation of the prop vowel before the ending *-wa*. The usual TA equivalent is TA *-wā*, as given by the manuals. Attested are the forms TA *arwā*, TA

---

[7] On this question, see basically Malzahn, 2007a, 286ff. It seems to me that the Araṇemi manuscript shows a couple of such copying errors such as *märsāne* instead of *pärsāte* in 88 a 3.

camwā, TA *prakwā-ci*, TA *yāmwā*, TA *lyockwā*, and TA *wackwā*.[8] Since TA *-wā* cannot be a lautgesetzlich equivalent of TB *-wa*, Ringe, 1990, 208 assumes analogical introduction of the ending *-ā* found in the *ā*-preterit (where *-ā* results from contraction of *-āwā). In addition, Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 50ff. = Winter, 2005, 434ff. have shown that Tocharian A also still possessed the lautgesetzlich ending variant TA *-u*. They adduce the following examples: TA *kñasu* in YQ 4 a 1, TA *campu* in A 230 a 4, TA *prasku* in A 230 b 3, and TA *wīyu* and TA *trīkū* in A 295 a 4. To these one can now add TA *āwu* from [A]*o(-n)-* 'hit' in A 79 b 4; see Peyrot, 2007a, 800 and Carling, DThTA, s.v. *o-n-*. In the case of [A]*cämp-* 'be able', both ending variants are attested. Beside the archaic ending TA *-u*, all forms with this ending except TA *kñasu* and TA *campu* are also irregular in various other ways: TA *wīyu* and TA *trīkū* have a synchronically irregular non-full root vowel instead of an expected full vowel, and they are further both intransitive although they look like members of the transitive antigrundverb paradigms from the respective roots [A]*trik[(ä)]-* and [A]*wik[(ä)]-*. A similar judgment holds for intransitive TA *prasku* 'I was afraid' from [A]*pärsk[(ä)]-* 'be afraid'. These further irregularities support the assumption that we have to do with relic formations.

9.1.2.2. *The 3.pl. active*

The usual Pt III 3.pl. active ending is TB *-ar* (always bearing the accent; *-är* in MQ forms),[9] and TA *-är* < PT *-ärä, so that the 3.pl.act. ending of the *s*-preterit is clearly distinct from that of the *ā*-preterit *-āre*, TA *-ar* < PT *-āræ.

Roots that do not end in *-s* can in the 3.pl. active take on the ending component *-e* from the *ā*-preterit ending *-āre*, the outcome being mixed forms in *-are*, cf. Schmidt, 1986a, 647f. and Peyrot, 2008, 134, who show that this is a feature of the informal styles of Tocharian B, i.e., to be found in business documents and in texts of eastern

---

[8] Whether one can separate a 1.sg.act. Pt III TA *yowā* in A 111 a 2 remains uncertain. However, the form would be a correct 1.sg. Pt III, cf. Winter 1965a, 207 = 1984, 174 = 2005, 132, fn. 1.

[9] The non-accented *-är* forms from non-MQ texts listed in the manuals do not exist: instead of *krempär* one has to read the expected *krempar* (see s.v. *krämp[(ä)]-* 'be hindered'); as for *wsär* attested in BM, this manuscript has MQ character, so that *-är* is expected; this leaves *rotkär-ne* (Š), which, however, is not a Pt III, but a Pt I in the first place; see chap. Pt I 7.2.1.1.

provenance.[10] The addition of -*e* may be interpreted as a hypercorrection, because 3.pl. active forms of the *ā*-preterit can lose the final -*e* on their part in the informal and eastern variety of Tocharian B; see chap. Pt I 7.2.

9.1.3. *Pt Class III > Pt Class I*

The members of the Pt III paradigms that had stem-final (*)-Vsā- were virtually ambiguous and could therefore be reanalyzed as Pt I forms; for various examples see chap. Pt I 7.2.2.

9.1.4. *Ablaut*

In both Tocharian A and B, ablauting *s*-preterits usually show PT *æ as root vowel through the whole active stem (TA -*a*-/TB -*e*-), and zero grade through the entire middle stem. Full-vowel roots do normally not show internal ablaut at all, with the exceptions of *ār*[(a)]- Antigv. 'leave', *kau*- 'kill', and *tās-/*[A]*tā(-s)*- 'put'. *ār*[(a)]- and *kau*- even show intra-paradigmatic ablaut between the active singular and active plural: *ār*[(a)]- Antigv. 'leave' with 1.sg. *orwa*, 2.sg. *orasta*, 3.sg. *orsa-c*, 3.pl. *arar-c*; *kau*- 'destroy' with 3.sg. *kowsa* (Š)[11] (beside 1.sg. *kauwa*, 3.sg. *kausa*), 1.pl. *kawam*, 3.pl. *kawar*. No such intra-paradigmatic ablaut is found in Tocharian A. Ablaut between active and middle (mostly of the PT *æ : *ä pattern) appears in the following stems:

tās- act. 'put', mid. 'place oneself' with 3.sg. *tessa/tesa*, 3.pl. *tesar/tesare*, 3.sg.mid. *tässāte*, 3.pl.mid. *tässānte*; cf. 1.sg.mid. *tasāmai*, 2.sg.mid. *tasātai*, 3.sg.mid. *tasāte*, 3.pl.mid. *tasānte* = [A]*tā(-s)*- 'id.' with 3.sg. *casäs*, 3.pl. *casär*, 1.sg.mid. *tse*, 2.sg.mid. *tsāte*, 3.pl.mid. *tsānt*; *käl*- 'bear' with 2.sg. *kelasta*, 3.sg. *keltsa*, 1.pl.mid. *kälsāmai*; *näm*- act. 'bend', mid. 'bow' with 3.pl. *nemar-neś*, 3.sg.mid. *namtsate-ñ*; *pärk*- 'ask' with 1.sg. *prekuwa*, 3.sg. *preksa*, 3.pl. *prekar*, 3.pl.mid. *parksante-ne* = [A]*pärk*- 'id.' with 1.sg. *prakwā-ci*, 3.sg. *prakäs*, 3.sg.mid. *präksāt/pärksāt*, 3.pl.mid. *präksānt*; *pälk*[(a)]- Antigv. 'burn' with 1.sg. *pelykwa*, 3.sg. *pelyksa*, 2.sg.mid. *palyksatai*; *räk*[(a)]- Antigv. 'extend, cover' with 3.sg. *reksa-me*, 1.sg.mid. *räksāmai* (MQ), 3.sg.mid. *raksate*; *lut*- act. 'remove',

---

[10] Accordingly, Sieg/Siegling's restoration to a 3.pl.act. Pt III *(pre)kare* in 9 a 1 (instead of regular 3.pl.act. Pt III *prekar*) is indeed not impossible (pace Thomas, [2]TochSprR(B), 154). To be sure, this is neither an eastern nor an informal-style text.

[11] Probably also attested in the small fragment THT 1131 frg. o a 1.

mid. 'cross' with 1.sg. *lyautwa*, 3.sg. *lyautsa-ñ*, 2.pl. *lautso* (sic), 3.pl. *lyautar*, 1.sg.mid. *lyutsāmai* (MQ), 2.sg.mid. *lyutstsatai*, 3.pl.mid. *lyutstsante*.

A root vowel PT *æ (> TB *e*) in the middle stem is confined to Tocharian B and attested in the following cases:

käs- act. 'quench, extinguish', mid. 'come to extinction': 3.sg. *kessa*, 3.pl.mid. *kessante*; *täm-* med. *tantum* 'be born': 3.sg.mid. *temtsate*, etc.; *näk-* act. 'destroy, lose', mid. 'fall into ruin, disappear': 3.sg. *neksa*, 3.sg.mid. *neksate*; *tsäk-* act. 'burn (tr)', mid. 'burn (itr)': 3.pl. *tsekär* (MQ), 1.pl.mid. *tseksamai*.

In Tocharian A, no such full-grade middle forms are attested,[12] and this is no surprise, because in such cases Tocharian A regularly responds with a root preterit form (also showing the result of PT *æ); see Jasanoff, 2003, 180, and chap. Pt 0.

Some roots irregularly show a root vowel (*)-*ä*- in the active forms; in Tocharian B, there is at least 2.sg. *masta*, 3.sg. *masa/massa/msā-ne* from *mä(s)ˀ-* 'go', and (1.sg. *wsāwa*, 2.sg. *wsāsta*,) 3.sg. *wasa/wsā-ne/wsa*; 1.pl. *wasam/wsam*, 3.pl. *wsar-ne/wsar/wsare/wsär-ñi/wäsare* (/*wsāre*) from *wä(s)ˀ-* 'give', the latter matched in Tocharian A by (1.sg. TA *wsā*, 2.sg. TA *wsāṣt*,) 3.sg. TA *wäs*, 3.pl. TA *wäsr-äṃ*.

A third TB example may be provided by the hapax 3.pl.act. *särpar ka* probably from a root *särpˀ-* 'beat', if this is not a Pt I form with loss of final -*e* in front of a clitic (thus WTG, 298), but because of the fragmentary context it is far from certain that this is a 3.pl. Pt form at all, cf. Peyrot, 2008, 135.[13]

In Tocharian A, there are some more forms of this kind, and one of them even clearly lacks possible root-initial palatalization:

ᴬmäsk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be': 3.sg. TA *mäskäs*, 3.pl. TA *mäskär*;[14] *ᴬwäl-* 'die': 3.sg. TA *wläs*, 1.pl. TA *wälmäs*; *ᴬspärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'get lost': 3.sg. TA *spärksā-m* (NB: not †*ṣp-*!). Here also certainly belong the 1.sg. TA *wīyu* from *ᴬwi⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'be frightened' and the 1.sg. TA *trīkū* from *ᴬtrik⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'fail, etc.'.

What all of these TA forms (except those from *ᴬwä(s)ˀ-* 'give') have further in common is that they are intransitive. What is more, for structural reasons *s*-preterits made from the roots *ᴬspärk⁽ᵃ⁾-*, *ᴬwi⁽ᵃ⁾-*,

---

[12] *ᴬar-* 'evoke' with 1.sg. TA *arwā*, 3.sg.mid. TA *arsāt*, however, has persistent *a*-vowel (= TB *er-*).

[13] Instead of a 1.sg.act. *räkwā* (MQ) from *räk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'extend, cover', one should better restore a fem.pl. PPt *(re)räkwā* in 339 a 6 (M. Peyrot, p.c.).

[14] But this Pt III inflection instead of the expected Pt I inflection can only be something secondary, probably caused by an irregular weakening of *mäskā- to *mäskä-*; this verb will certainly have ranked among the most frequently used ones, and therefore could have easily undergone irregular sound change.

and ^{A}trik$^{(a)}$- would be expected to belong to their transitive antigrundverb paradigms.[15] Note, however, that intransitive valency is also attested for other stem formations of the antigrundverb paradigms from the roots ^{AB}trik$^{(a)}$- and ^{AB}spärk$^{(a)}$-. The forms in question are hence to be regarded as archaisms, which is further supported by the fact that TA *wīyu* and TA *trīkū* show precisely the arguably more archaic ending variant TA -*u* (see above).

In sum, we usually have to do with an ablauting paradigm having PT *æ as root vowel in the whole active and zero grade in the whole middle. Very few roots show intra-paradigmatic ablaut between the singular and plural forms of the active, and a few more show an *ä*-vowel in the singular active stem.

9.1.5. *The preterit participle*

In Tocharian B, there are three different types of PPts attested beside a finite *s*-preterit stem, though all of them show the endings -*u*, -*oṣ*:

1. Reduplication with the reduplication vowel *e* and *ä* as root vowel, e.g., *peparku/ peparkoṣ* from *pärk*- 'ask';

2. Reduplication with the reduplication vowel *e* and *e* as root vowel, e.g., *kekenu/ kekenoṣ* from *kän$^{(a)}$*- 'come about'; similarly, we have reduplication with the vowel (*)*ā* when *ā* is the root vowel, e.g., *papyāku/ papyākoṣ* from *pyāk*- 'strike';

3. No reduplication and *ä* as root vowel is attested by the following forms: **ku* (in *kuwermeṃ*) from *ku*- 'pour'; *tänkuweṣ* from *tänk*- 'hinder'; *putkuweṣ* from *putk*- 'shut'; *plätku* (S)/ *plätkweṣ* (MQ) from *plätk*- 'overflow', and *litku* from *litk$^{(a)?}$*- 'avert'; the accent of *plätku* (S) shows that we have to do with the same PPt type as in the case of *ltu*, *ltuweṣ*. Strictly speaking, there are no finite preterit forms from *tänk*- and *putk*- attested at all, but at least *plätk*- forms a finite *s*-preterit, so one may suppose the same for the other two roots. **puttu* from *pätt$^?$*- 'climb' may also belong here, although no unambiguous verbal form is attested from this root at all, and the same is true for the isolated *plutku* from *plutk*- '± arise?' and *snätku* from a root *snätk$^?$*- 'infuse'.

It is not entirely predictable when a PPt belongs to type 1 and when to type 2; however, two facts are clear: there does not seem to be

---

[15] Another example for what seems to be an intransitive *s*-preterit stem formation that, however, acts as an imperfect comes from ^{A}klāw^{ä}- 'fall' with 3.pl. TA *klawrä* in YQ 5 a 6.

a correlation between the ablaut of the finite *s*-preterit forms and the respective PPt formation.[16] On the other hand, there does seem to be a kind of correlation between the PPt and the respective subjunctive stem: if a root forms a subjunctive of Class II, it has a PPt of type 1 (i.e., *ä* as root vowel); if a root forms a subjunctive of Class III, it has a PPt of type 2 (i.e., PT *æ as root vowel). Since a subjunctive of Class III is usually paired with a Class I subjunctive, which also regularly has PT *æ in the singular active, one may venture the guess that the ablaut of the PPt is indeed correlated with the ablaut of a respective singular active subjunctive stem. However, there are also roots forming a subjunctive of Class I (with no Sub III beside them) not having a PPt of type 2: *ku-* 'pour', *kau-* 'kill', *pärk-* 'ask', *ri-n-* 'leave', *si-n-* 'lean on', *putk-* 'shut' and *plätk-* 'overflow'. As for *putk-* and *plätk-*, they have a PPt of type 3; similarly, *ku-* seems to have a PPt **keku* of the *śeśu*-type; *ri-n-* and *si-n-* are secondary roots that do not show intra-paradigmatic ablaut at all, but at least *pärk-* (with 1.sg. Sub I *preku*) should have formed a PPt †*pepreku* instead of the attested *peparku*, if the above given scenario is entirely valid.

In the end, one must admit that no pattern for the formation of the PPt immediately suggests itself.

In Tocharian A, the structure of the PPt standing beside *s*-preterits is correlated in the usual way with the root structure; see chap. PPt 14.1.2.

9.1.6. *Palatalization of the root initial*

In Tocharian A, palatalization of the root initial in the finite *s*-preterit only occurs in the active stem, but never in the middle. The palatalized active stem forms in this case show a former æ-grade of the root (TA *-a-*, or the outcomes from former diphthongs TA *-e-* and TA *-o-*), while the non-palatalized middle has the root vowel *-ä-*, no doubt as the outcome of a former zero grade. In Tocharian B, there are also palatalized middle forms attested, i.e., forms with palatalizing *ä* as root vowel, but all of these cases have a palatalized active form beside them: 2.sg.mid. *palyksatai* beside 1.sg.act. *pelykwa*, 3.sg.act.

---

[16] Peyrot, 2008, 152 with ref. to a forthcoming article in HS argues that "the root vowel of the preterite participle is identical to the root vowel of the preterite if the preterite is not grading". Although this is a reasonable assumption, it does not fit the facts entirely, so that he has to assume analogical leveling as in the case of *neneku* discussed p. 152f.

pelyksa from *pälk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'burn' and 1.sg.mid. *lyutsāmai* (MQ), 2.sg.mid. *lyutstsatai*, 3.pl.mid. *lyutstsante* beside 3.sg.act. *lyautsa*, etc. from *lut*- 'remove'.

There are several inconsistencies with respect to palatalization in Pt III:

1. Tocharian B can show either palatalized or non-palatalized root-initial consonants (/clusters) in finite *s*-preterit forms from roots with a palatalizable root initial consonant and PT *æ/ä as root vowels;

2. Tocharian A can show palatalized finite active *s*-preterit forms standing beside non-palatalized respective PPts; no similar discrepancy between finite preterit stem and PPt is attested in Tocharian B.

9.1.6.1.   *Palatalized vs. non-palatalized finite forms*

Most *s*-preterit forms with PT *æ/ä as root vowels from roots with a palatalizable initial consonant (cluster) do not show palatalization in Tocharian B, so I do not list them separately here. The few instances that do show palatalization are:

1.sg. *ñauskuwa* from *nusk*- 'squeeze' (PPt *ñeñusku*); 1.sg. *pelykwa*,[17] 3.sg. *pelyksa*, 2.sg.mid. *palyksatai* from *pälk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Antigv. 'burn' (PPt *pepalykusai*); 3.sg. *plyeṅksa* (etc., often, beside once-attested *pleksa* and at least twice-attested 1.sg. *pleṅkuwa*, the latter forms all from business documents) from *pläṅk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Antigv. 'sell' (PPt *peplyaṅku*); 3.sg. *plyewsa* from *plu*- 'float'; 1.sg.mid. *lyuksamnte* from *luk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Antigv. mid. 'light up', 3.sg. *lyauksa/lyeᵤksa*, etc. from *luk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Antigv. act. 'illuminate' (PPt *lyelyūku*); 3.sg. *lyautsa*, etc. from *lut*- 'remove' (often, beside once-attested *lautso*); 3.sg. *ṣerpsa*, 3.pl. *ṣerpar-me* from *ṣärp*- 'indicate' (PPt *ṣeṣärpu*). Whether *śauwa* from *kau*- Kaus. IV 'let (?) kill' belongs here as well is uncertain; see the discussion below.

In Tocharian A, on the other hand, almost every finite *s*-preterit with PT *æ as root vowel from a root with palatalizable root initial indeed shows root-initial palatalization: e.g., 3.pl. TA *śarkr-äṃ* from *ᴬkärk*- 'bind'; 3.sg. *casäs*, etc. from *ᴬtā(-s)*- 'put'; 3.pl. *caṅkär* from *ᴬtäṅk*- 'hinder'; etc.

Note that palatalization of the root initial can also be inferred in cases where the consonant immediately after the root vowel is palatalized as in: TA *palyäṣt* from *ᴬpäl⁽ᵃ⁾*- Antigv. 'extinguish'; TA

---

[17] On root-final *ly* as indicator of *initial* palatalization, see chap. Sound Laws 1.7.

plyocksā-m from *[A]plutk-* '± arise'; TA *lyockwā* from *[A]lutk[(ä)?]-* 'make, turn into'; TA *wackwā* from *[A]wätk[(ä)]-* Antigv. 'separate' (note that the PPt presupposed by TA *watkuräṣ* does not have -*c*-, but -*t*-); see chap. Sound Laws 1.7.

As for 3.sg. TA *kosā-m* from *[A]ko-* 'destroy' and the *s*-imperfect 3.pl. TA *klawrä* from *[A]klāw[ä]-* 'fall', these forms do not belong to roots with root vowels PT *æ/ä.

The situation met in Tocharian B clearly looks like a *lectio difficilior*. Accordingly, one would very much like to assume that with respect to roots with root vowels PT *æ/ä, (pre-)Tocharian A had generalized root-initial palatalization in the active paradigms and non-palatalization in the middle forms, and that Tocharian B simply preserved the original pre-Toch. < pre-PT state of affairs with respect to root-initial palatalization in finite forms of preterit Class III. The problem with such an assumption is that in at least two cases, the non-palatalization found in Tocharian B cannot be original from an Indo-Europeanist's point of view, because TB *tes(s)-* from *tās-* 'put, set, place' clearly goes back to PIE *$dʰeh_1$-s-,[18] and TB *teksa* from *täk-* 'touch' probably derives from PIE *$tēHg$-,[19] or maybe from a PIE *teh_1g-.[20] Note, however, that the TA 2.sg.act. Ipv III *ptas* from *[A]tā(-s)-* seems to imply that (pre-)Tocharian A once also had a Pt III [†]*tas-* rather than *cas(s)-*. Note further that in Proto-Tocharian, the two respective roots must originally have had an extremely uncommon root allomorphy in the preterit, viz. *$t'æ$-(s-) vs. *$tā$-(s-) and *$t'æk$- vs. *$tāk$- (or perhaps *$tå̊k$-), so maybe in these two special cases the result of pre-PT root-initial *$tē$- had been depalatalized already in PT times as a result of irregular intra-paradigmatic leveling in two quite irregular paradigms.

9.1.6.2.   *Finite s-preterit vs. PPt*

Tocharian A usually shows a non-palatalized PPt beside any kind of respective finite *s*-preterit forms (cf., e.g., PPt TA *kakärku* beside 3.pl. Pt III TA *śarkr-äṃ* from *[A]kärk-* 'bind'). However, there also exist some palatalized PPts beside *s*-preterits, and all of the respective finite

---

[18] See, e.g., Ringe, 1996, 142; Peters, 2006, 339, fn. 25.

[19] The root-initial palatalization in the resulting PT *$t'æk$- was still preserved in the respective TB and TA *present* paradigms (3.sg.act. *ceśäṃ*, 3.pl.act. *ceken-ne*, etc.; TA 3.pl.act. *ckeñc*).

[20] If Gk. -$ταγ$- can go back to *-$tʰ_1g$- due to a special sound law *(-)$Cʰ_1K$- > (-)CaK-, cf., e.g., $τέμαχος$ from *√$temh_1$ (M. Peters, p.c.).

preterit forms show palatalization themselves. There is no palatalized PPt beside a non-palatalized finite *s*-preterit attested. It is further noticeable that all these examples come from roots beginning with *l°*: TA *lyaly(i)pu* beside 3.sg. Pt III TA *lyepäs* from *Alip(a)-* Antigv. 'leave'; PPt TA *lyaly(u)ku* from *Aluk-* Antigv. 'illuminate' beside palatalized 3.sg. Pt III TA *lyokäs*. Here may also belong PPt TA *lyalyutu* (if restored correctly), which may be analyzed as belonging to an (unattested) *s*-preterit because the stems Prs VIII/Sub VII are usually paired with Pt III rather than with Pt II. However, one cannot rule out the possibility that all of these palatalized PPt forms belonged to a preterit of Class II instead. In the case of *Aluk-* Antigv. 'illuminate', a finite Pt II form TA *lyalyuk* is actually indeed attested beside the Pt III TA *lyokäs*. The same cannot be ruled out for the other forms (even though a Pt II is unattested), the more so since due to the merger of *s*- and *sk*-presents in Tocharian A kausativum and antigrundverb formations could easily fall together into one oppositional paradigm — but note that TA *lyalyku* and TA *lyalypu* cannot be regular PPts belonging to a Pt II.

In Tocharian B, the relationship with respect to initial palatalization between the finite *s*-preterit stem and the PPt is more straightforward: if the finite *s*-preterit stem shows initial palatalization the PPt also does, cf.:

PPt *ñeñusku* beside 1.sg. *ñauskuwa* from *nusk-* 'squeeze';[21] PPt *pepalykusai/ pepälykoṣ* beside 3.sg. *pelyksa* from *pälk(a)-* Antigv. 'burn';[22] PPt *peplyaṅku* beside 3.sg. *plyeṅksa* (and *pleksa*) from *pläṅk(a)-* Antigv. 'sell'; PPt *lyelyūku/ lyelyukoṣ* beside 3.sg. *lyauksa/lyeu̯ksa* from *luk(a)-* Antigv. act. 'illuminate'; PPt *ṣeṣärpu* beside 3.sg. *ṣerpsa* from *ṣärp-* 'indicate'.

Accordingly, in Tocharian B there existed many PPts belonging to a Pt III that looked precisely like PPts belonging to a Pt II, whereas Tocharian A synchronically quite possibly did not have such a kind of PPts at all. Again one would like to assume that Tocharian B had preserved the original state of affairs, and that Tocharian A had innovated. If this is true, Tocharian A could have lost PPts with a PT structure *C'æ-C'äC-äwä belonging to finite Pt III forms in various

---

[21] Hackstein, 1995, 185 argued that this palatalized PPt is better to be analyzed as a Pt II stem formation. However, since the Pt III form is also palatalized and the PPt attestation does not seem to have causative meaning, I rather analyze it as a Pt III form.

[22] On root-final *ly* as indicator of *initial* palatalization, see chap. Sound Laws 1.7.

different ways, that is, by depalatalizing already existing forms of that structure, by building new forms (rather of the PT structure *Cæ-CæC-äwä) to replace the older ones, and by building new finite Pt II forms around preserved PPts of precisely the PT structure *C'æ-C'äC-äwä. I think a clear instance of the latter strategy is provided by the root ṣärp-/^{A}ṣärp- 'indicate'; here, the TB PPt ṣeṣärpu belongs to a Pt III 3.sg. ṣerpsa, but the TA PPt ṣaṣärpu, which can obviously be traced back to PT *s'æ-s'ärp-äwä as much as the TB PPt, synchronically belongs to a Pt II 3.sg. ṣaṣärp.

9.1.7. Function

The s-preterit has two main functions: it can serve as normal preterit stem of roots that usually do not have A-character[23] with both transitive and intransitive valency; it can further constitute an oppositional transitive preterit (i.e., opposed to an intransitive preterit stem of a different stem formation). In Tocharian B, the s-preterit may in addition function as a real causative preterit, i.e., belong to a Kausativum IV paradigm, if the 1.sg.act. forms śauwwa (266 b 2) and śauwa-me H add. 149 88 b 7 are indeed Pt III (and not Pt II) forms and are further to be interpreted as let-causatives from kau- 'kill' (thus Krause, WTG, 187, § 182).[24] In my opinion, however, the passages in question can as easily be translated by mere 'I killed' (see s.v. kau-). On the other hand, if we really have to do with a let-causative, the forms can also be analyzed as forms of Pt II in the first place.[25]

Some scholars tried to assign a certain semantic or semanto-syntactic function to the s-preterit forms with palatalized root-initial consonant.

Winter, apud Adams, 1988a, 83 "points out (p.c.) that in Tocharian A we have a generalization of (PIE) *ē. [...] Tocharian B shows (PIE) *ē only in a limited subclass of verbs of motion". But since there are many counterexamples to this claim such as the 1.sg. Pt III ñauskuwa

---

[23] An exception is mit$^{(a)}$- 'set out' which, most unusually, has Prs III and Sub V beside what looks like an already PT s-preterit stem.

[24] Pace TEB I, 250, § 445 and Hilmarsson, 1991, 101, the 2.sg.mid. aiksātaiy (MQ) from aik- 'know' does not have to be a causative; see the discussion s.v. aik- 'know'.

[25] śauwwa < *śå/āw-āwā with loss of *ā between w_w, as per Winter, 1965, 204 = 2005, 120.

from *nusk-* 'squeeze, (de)press', I do not think that we have to do with such a pattern at all.

Somewhat similarly, Ringe, 1990, 189 seems to think that root-initial palatalization in Pt III forms could have been induced secondarily as a marker of causativity.[26]

What can indeed be observed is that all TA *s*-preterits that are confined to the middle never belong to an antigrundverb or kausativum, but it is possible that all of them are simply secondarily sigmatized former zero-grade root aorists.[27] This may, however, just prove the secondary status of the middle *s*-preterit. As for Tocharian B, no correlation between palatalization and affiliation to an antigrundverb or kausativum can be observed:

The 1.sg.act. *ñauskuwa* from *nusk-* 'squeeze' (tr) has no grundverb beside it and the root most likely derives directly from a PIE *-sk̂e/o-present stem formation; the 3.sg.act. *plyewsa* from *plu-* float' is, on the other hand, intransitive, and so is the 1.sg.mid. *lyuksamnte* from *luk^(a)-* Antigv. mid. 'light up', but this may not be a reliable case, because the *s*-stem can be a replacement of a former root preterit; the active 3.sg. *lyautsa* from *lut-* 'remove' is transitive, though synchronically not part of an antigrundverb or kausativum (this particular root forms causative alternation by voice alternation, so if palatalization was indeed a mark of transitivity/causativity we would not expect palatalization in the intransitive middle *s*-preterit forms); the same can be said of *ṣerp-* from *ṣärp-* 'indicate'. To antigrundverbs do belong the 3.sg. *pelyksa* from *pälk^(a)-* Antigv. 'burn'; the 3.sg. *plyeṅksa* from *pläṅk^(a)-* Antigv. 'sell'; the 3.sg. *lyeu̯ksa* from *luk^(a)-* Antigv. act. 'illuminate'.

All in all, no synchronic correlation between root-initial palatalization, lack of such, and a certain semantic or semanto-syntactic function can be found.

9.1.8. *The middle s-preterit*

Tocharian A has a small class of middle, intransitive root preterits with a root vowel PT *æ standing beside respective active, transitive *s-*

---

[26] See also Ringe, 1996, 142 on the occasion of forms such as TA *lyockwā* with two palatalized consonants (*ly-* and *-c-*).

[27] In some cases this may be just due to chance, because it cannot be excluded that a medium tantum root like *^Ayärk-* 'honor' (tr) once had an intransitive grundverb beside it.

preterits. In historical Tocharian B, no such root-preterit stem formations are attested any more, and the forms in question seem to have been turned into respective forms with (*)*sā* before the endings. On the other hand, in Tocharian A there is only one possible example of a middle *s*-preterit form used as oppositional intransitive.[28] This raises the question of the status of the middle *s*-preterit in Tocharian.

At first glance, the middle *s*-preterit in Tocharian is not so uncommon. In Tocharian A, however, there are not too many middle *s*-preterits attested to verbal roots that also show active inflection elsewhere. Most middle *s*-preterits in Tocharian A are attested from verbs that are media tantum (or at least may be media tantum):

A̱āl⁽ᵃ⁾ʔ- 'keep away' (tr) (m/-/m) (VIII/VII/III), *Aemts⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'seize, take' (tr) (m+/m/m) (VIII/V/I+III), *Atränk-* 'cling, stick' (itr) (m+/m/m) (VIII/I-VII/III), *Anāk-* 'blame' (tr) (m+/m/m) (VIII/VII/III), *Ayärk-* 'honor, venerate' (tr) (m/-/m) (VIII/-/III), *Ari(-n)-* 'leave, give up' (tr) (m+/m/m) (X/VII/III), *Awäs-* 'don, wear (clothes)' (itr/tr) (-/m/m) (II/IoV/III), *Asruk-* 'kill' (tr) (-/-/m) (-/-/II-III), *Atsāk-* 'glow' (itr) (m/m/m) (VIII/IoII/III).

Whenever there are both active and middle forms attested in the TA *s*-preterit, the middle forms do usually have a meaning (but not necessarily valency) different from that of the active, which then is, however, always a property of the whole paradigm the Pt III belongs to and not just of the Pt III:

Ao(-n)- (tr) (m/m/x) (X/VII/III) act. 'hit, wound', mid. 'begin', *Atā(-s)-* (tr/itr) (a/a/x) (II/II-V/III) act. 'put, set, place', mid. 'place oneself', *Apärk-* (tr) (x/m/x) (VIII/I/III) act. 'ask for, beg', mid. 'ask, bring up a question', *Aplāk-* (itr) (-/-/m) (-/-/III) mid. 'ask for permission' [cf. *plāk-* (itr) (a/a/m) (VIII/I/III) act. 'agree', mid. 'ask for permission'], *Apyutk-* (itr/tr) (a/x/x) (VIII/IX/II-III) act. 'come into being' (itr!), mid. 'establish, create, accomplish' (tr!), *Asi-n-* act. (tr/itr) (x/m/m) (X/VII/III) 'satiate', mid. 'satiate oneself', 'be depressed'.

The only middle *s*-preterit forms attested alongside active *s*-preterit forms showing no different meaning from that of the active (though, of course, possibly middle semantics such as "for oneself" or passive function) are attested from the roots *Aar-* 'evoke' (tr) (x/m/x) (VIII/VII/III), *Aep-* 'cover' (tr) (-/-/III) (-/-/x), and *Ayām-* 'do' (tr) (-/x/x) (-/II/0-III), two of which also have middle beside active forms

---

[28] This possible example is provided by *Asi-n-* act. 'satiate', mid. 'satiate oneself', 'be depressed'; *Ao(-n)-* act. 'hit', mid. 'begin' also has a middle Pt III, but here voice alternation shows a difference in meaning, and the middle forms of *Ao(-n)-* are also transitive.

in the respective present and subjunctive stems. However, ^{A}*yām-* also has a middle root preterit, which can only be an archaism.[29]

As for Tocharian B, the middle is attested more often, which is no surprise because Tocharian B has given up the root preterit completely and turned it precisely into middle preterits in (*)-*sā-*.

Schmidt, 1974, 57f., fn. 2 seems to suggest that the middle *s*-preterit from *käm-* 'come' (standing beside an active-only, thematic preterit stem of Class VI) could be an inherited middle *s*-aorist, although Narten, 1964, 30f., to whom he refers, rather judges the Vedic sigmatic forms as innovations. In view of the fact that the middle *s*-preterit was productive in Tocharian B, it cannot be taken as evidence for an inherited *s*-aorist (cf. Kim, 2009, 36, fn. 46), regardless of the fact that the middle preterit from that root seems to have a special meaning 'come together with' (as per Schmidt, 1974, 472ff.) which can just as easily be secondary, the more since this kind of use of an "intensives Medium" is, according to Schmidt himself, one of the more productive functions of the middle in Tocharian.[30]

9.1.9. *Summary of the synchronic facts*

The (active and middle) *s*-preterit functions as normal preterit formation for roots without A-character of both transitive and intransitive valency. It may also serve as oppositional transitive part of what was (at least originally) an antigrundverb (and maybe even as causative part of a kausativum) paradigm. The conspicuous suffix PT *-*sā*- only shows up in the 3.sg. active and in the whole middle. Roots with PT *æ/*ä-ablaut usually show no ablaut in the active, but do show ablaut between the active and the middle, the active then having PT *æ as root vowel, the middle PT *ä. Only two roots with root vowels *å̃/*ā even show ablaut between the active singular and the active plural. As for root-initial palatalization, which is probably confined to roots with PT *æ/*ä-ablaut, Tocharian A always shows palatalization in the active forms, and never in the middle; the latter probably also holds for the affiliated PPt forms. In Tocharian B, some

---

[29] I cannot see on what model a frequent transitive root like ^{A}*yām-* could have secondarily created a likewise transitive Pt 0 beside a transitive middle Pt III.

[30] Hilmarsson, 1991, 106 further claimed the existence of an active *s*-preterit from this root on the basis of the PPt *kekamu*, but this PPt can only be a secondarily reduplicated *kämäwä, and therefore could have perfectly well belonged to the Pt VI made from this root right from the start.

roots show palatalization and the rest does not; whenever the active has a palatalized root initial in this language, the respective middle and the respective PPt forms also have, so that the latter look precisely like PPt forms belonging to a Pt II. No semantic or semanto-syntactic function can be assigned to the presence or absence of palatalization in Tocharian B. Middle forms with *-sā- are found in both languages and may therefore have already existed in Proto-Tocharian, but it is also obvious that at least many of these forms are only substitutes of older forms lacking *-sā-.

9.2.   DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

There are basically three theories available for the diachronic background of the finite Tocharian *s*-preterit:
1. The aorist/perfect merger theory
2. The "classical" PIE *s*-aorist theory
3. The cognate of *ḥi*-conjugation theory

9.2.1. *The aorist/perfect merger theory*

The assumption that the Tocharian *s*-preterit is due to a merger of the "classical" PIE *s*-aorist[31] and the classical PIE active perfect may be regarded as the most widespread theory, and it is the one adopted by Krause/Thomas (WTG, 180, fn. 1; TEB I, 247, fn. 1); see the discussion of the relevant literature in VW II/2, 154ff.; Lindeman, 1972, 44ff.; Ringe, 1990, 183ff.

This view is based on the fact that the *s*-preterit shows morphological characteristics of both the PIE *s*-aorist and the PIE perfect, notably *o*/zero-grade ablaut and at the same time *ē*-ablaut. The lack of the *s*-suffix in all active persons but the 3.sg. can within this framework be explained as due to influence from the perfect, see, e.g., Adams, 1978, 282; 1988a, 82f.: "[t]hose PIE perfects which did not take the preterital -*ā*- became amalgamated with the sigmatic aorist" (but differently Adams, 1994; see below 9.2.3.).

In recent times the "classical" *s*-aorist/PIE perfect-merger theory has been defended by Winter, 1994a, 291ff. = 2005, 472ff.; Rasmussen,

---

[31] "Classical" as adnominal of "PIE *s*-aorist" may mean quite different things to different people, the common denominator being, at least, that all forms of the active paradigm had stem-final *-s-, and that the root in an *s*-aorist could not show *o*-ablaut.

1997, 145ff.; and Hackstein, 2005, 171; Hackstein refers to similar perfect/*s*-aorist syncretism found in other languages.

Winter, 1994a, 291ff. = 2005, 472ff. adopts the classical merger theory inasmuch as he derives the Tocharian A forms and those showing initial palatalization in Tocharian B from the "classical" PIE *s*-aorist, but the Tocharian B ones without initial palatalization from the classical PIE perfect.

Rasmussen, 1997, 149 assumes a general merger of both PIE verbal categories in Tocharian.[32] He claims that the aorist gradually took over the morphology of the perfect, and that in the 3.sg. active the suffix -*s*- remained because of the respective perfect ending *-e not showing a "konsonantisches Merkmal", and the *s*-ending being preferred over "einer bloßen Nullform".

Scholars defending this theory generally assume that the reduplication of the perfect was given up in analogy with the non-reduplicated *s*-aorist. In my opinion, one can now actually present relics of *s*-preterits showing a former reduplication syllable, i.e., *otkasa-me* < PT *wäwætk- and *orsa-c* < pre-PT *ār- < PIE *h₂e-h₂or(H)- beside 3.pl. *arar-c* < pre-PT *ar- < PIE *h₂e-h₂r̥H-, which was seen by Peters, forthc.; see also the diachronic discussion in chap. Sub I/V 18.7.1.1.1.

Peters, forthc., basically subscribes to the old theory that Pt III goes back to a merger of reduplicated perfect forms and unreduplicated aorist forms providing the palatalized examples of Pt III, but he reconstructs this aorist type very differently from the classical PIE *s*-aorist. He thinks that the element -*sā(-)* of Pt III has only little to do with a sigmatic, or even "presigmatic" aorist, but started out as an *ending* of the 3.sg. As for the middle paradigm, Peters claims that the asigmatic inflection of the extremely frequent, and therefore most probably morphologically conservative, root *^Ayām-* 'do' shows that in the middle paradigms of Pt III, the element -*sā(-)* has been a late intruder even with regard to middle paradigms from old *transitive* roots. Such a view is shared by Ringe, 1990, 217, who also assumes that the suffix -*sā*- of the middle was "apparently borrowed from the active 3sg.", despite his general claim that the active forms met in Pt III paradigms derive exclusively from PIE sigmatic aorist forms. As for the PIE ancestor of his 3.sg. ending (*)-*sā*, Peters states that the Pt III endings of the 1.sg.act., 2.sg.act., and 2.pl.act. are strongly

---

[32] He derives the subjunctive morphologically from the PIE perfect, but semantically from the aorist subjunctive.

reminiscent of active perfect/middle II endings, and that the ending of the 3.pl.act., which he reconstructs as PIE *-ro, could have only belonged to a middle II paradigm, because of the final *-o owed to the middle I ending *-(e)nto, and not met in active perfect paradigms (as per Ringe, 1990, 199f.; Jasanoff, 2003; Tremblay, 2006, esp. 267). According to Peters, one should then expect a 3.sg. active ending of the Pt III to derive from the respective ending of middle II, which he claims to have been PIE *-e, and not *-o (see already Peters, 1975), especially on the evidence of the Greek thematic and sigmatic aorists. And since in Tocharian the respective endings of the 2.sg. and 2.pl. have an additional *-s- prefixed, which is met in other languages such as Latin as well, Peters argues that *-se then might be even more expected as the respective pre-PT 3.sg. ending than mere *-e.[33] As for the final -ā met in (*)-sā, he suggests that inherited pre-PT *-se (or alternatively first *-set with *-t analogically introduced from the thematic imperfects), was eventually turned into pre-PT *-sa(t) under the analogical influence of the 1. and 2.sg. endings pre-PT *-m/u̯a and *-sta, respectively, pointing to the well-known similar leveling met in the middle paradigms of the Ionic-Attic, Aeolic, and Doric-Northwest Greek dialectal groups of Ancient Greek (i.e., -μαι, -σοι, -τοι > -μαι, -σαι, -ται). Actually, he thinks that the early stage with *-se(t) is still reflected by the Class VIII presents, which he prefers to base on 3.sg. forms in pre-PT *-seti said by him to have been built by what I call the *tēzzi* principle precisely on such 3.sg. middle II forms in pre-PT *-se(t) (which then, of course, should have been, as a rule, old aorist forms rather than old imperfect forms). However, since one should not expect PIE *o*-grades or *ē*-grades in any kind of middle paradigms, and since the Class VIII presents typically show the verbal root in the zero grade, Peters is forced to assume that a blend has taken place: according to him, those middle II forms first had the same kind of root

---

[33] Actually, Peters, forthc., now thinks that PIE lacked any kind of true (pre)sigmatic aorist, and that the aorists of the various IE branches usually taken for sigmatic aorists were just Narten root aorists (and to a lesser degree also non-Narten root aorists) sigmatized in the course of the histories of the various branches in various different ways, with sigmatic middle II ending variants such as *-s-th₂e, *-s-e, *-s-h₂e having been the starting point for the spread of the *s*-element. For such a view cf. already Peters, 1975, 40, fn. 11, where the Gk. 3.sg. active forms of the sigmatic aorist ending in -σε were derived from PIE athematic middle II forms ending in *-s-e, which is an analysis that could, in his opinion, explain the complete lack of lengthened-grade sigmatic aorists in Greek effortlessly.

ablaut that is still seen in the Class VIII presents of historical Tocharian, i.e., zero grade in the case of non-Narten formations, and pre-PT *e*-grade in the case of Narten formations, and had rather the same semantics as the active forms built from the respective roots (mostly old root aorists), but maybe even more frequently active perfects turned into preterits, which as a consequence of this change replaced the respective old root aorists and eventually were also deredticated, after having served as a base for new reduplicated presents formed by what I call the *tēzzi* principle. As soon as in those active forms ending in pre-PT *-äm (> *-äu̯?), *-äs (> *-äh?), *-ät, etc., the word-final *-m(/*-u̯?), *-s(/*-h?), *-t had started to get lost, and therefore all the active singular forms were in danger of falling together in one single form, according to Peters the forms of the active paradigms were blended with the respective forms of the middle II paradigms, the first contributing *o*-, *ē*-, and *e*-grades of the root, and the latter the characteristic middle II endings. Now, in the aorist > preterit paradigms from stems ending in pre-PT *-a- and *-ā-, the active forms then should at first also have had *-m(/*-u̯?), *-s(/*-h?), *-t, etc. as endings, and since precisely *-m, *-s(/*-h?), *-t must have been bound to be lost after pre-PT *-a- and *-ā- as well, it would then be only consistent to expect a complete replacement of the old active endings of Pt I by the new set of active endings that according to Peters had emerged in Pt III. Peters, forthc., therefore feels obliged to adduce a special explanation for why we do not meet a 3.sg. active ending PT *-sā in Pt I (and in all other kinds of preterits following the inflectional model of Pt I) as well, and he actually suggests that the original 3.sg. forms of Pt I may have resisted the general takeover by the Pt III endings and may have been preserved exactly because at the time of that takeover, many of them may have differed from the respective forms of the 1. and 2.sg. by ablaut in the stem-final vowel, i.e., Early pre-PT *-āt may have turned via sound law into Late pre-PT *-a quite early, whereas Early pre-PT *-ām/*-āu̯ and Early pre-PT *-ās/*-āh clearly should not have turned their Early pre-PT *-ā- by sound law into Late pre-PT *-a- > PT *-ā- at all.

9.2.2. *The "classical" PIE s-aorist theory*

Ringe, 1990, passim, derives the Tocharian *s*-preterit directly from the "classical" PIE *s*-aorist, viz. one that had a suffix *-s- and lengthened grade *ē in the root through the whole active. Assuming quite a lot of analogical changes, he tries to show that the *s*-suffix could have been

lost in all the active forms in which it does not surface. Denying any influence of the PIE perfect on the Tocharian *s*-preterit, he does not set up pre-PT *o*-grades for the unpalatalized forms, but assumes mere depalatalization that came, in his opinion, about in analogy to respective middle forms. Ringe, 1990, 217f. further states that a middle *s*-aorist in PIE is "scarcely reconstructable", and consequently assumes that the Tocharian middle *s*-preterit as a whole derived from the middle root aorist by addition of *-sā-* (cf. also Kim, 2009, 34ff.).

Kortlandt, 1994, 61ff. also claims that the Tocharian *s*-preterit is to be derived from the "classical" PIE *s*-aorist. In his framework the *s*-suffix is lost due to a sound law by which *-s- was lost in word-final context after following obstruents, which were subsequently also lost (2.sg.act. *-s-s, 3.sg.act. *-s-t); in addition, he assumes that *-s- was also lost between consonants, and was consequently only preserved in the 1.sg.act. and probably also in the 3.pl.act., from where it then spread to the 3.sg.act.; but see the objections to this scenario by Adams, 1994, 8.

9.2.3. *The cognate of ḫi-conjugation theory*

Pedersen, 1941 was the first to compare the confinement of *-s-* to the 3.sg. in the active of the Tocharian *s*-preterit with the exclusive use of *-š* in the 3.sg. active of the preterit of the Hittite *ḫi*-conjugation.[34]

Jasanoff, 1988, 55f.; 2003, passim, denies that the traditional PIE perfect had any influence in the establishment of the Tocharian *s*-preterit. The reasons for his view are the apparent lack of reduplication, and that in his opinion there is no direct evidence of any PIE perfect being continued in a Tocharian preterit at all. The evidence that was adduced in favor of the perfect/aorist-merger theory, i.e., the apparent *o*-grade ablaut and the occurrence of perfect endings are no valid arguments for Jasanoff, because in his framework of the PIE verbal system both the *o*-grade and these endings are not limited to the classical PIE perfect at all. Hence, according to Jasanoff, the Tocharian *s*-preterit more or less directly reflects an inherited "presigmatic aorist" — turned into the "classical" *s*-aorist only after the *Ausgliederung* of Anatolian and Tocharian — in which the *s*-suffix

---

[34] Pedersen further wanted to derive the other persons of the Tocharian active paradigm from the PIE thematic aorist, in which case we would nowadays, however, expect palatalized stem finals; see Ringe, 1990, 227, fn. 3, and Adams, 1994, 1f.

was precisely restricted to the 3.sg. active and the subjunctive (the latter being directly continued in the Tocharian *s*-present of Class VIII).

Similarly, Adams, 1994, 8ff. also denies any connection with the PIE perfect and prefers to derive the Tocharian *s*-preterit from one single paradigm he sets up precisely for this Tocharian category and also for a couple of other formations found in other branches, i.e., a PIE *is*-Aorist.

9.2.4. *Summary and conclusions*

As far as I can see, two out of the solutions adduced so far meet too many problems with regard to the actual Pt III forms, scil. the ones advanced by Ringe, 1990 and Adams, 1994.

As for Ringe's scenario, the following objections can be made. I think it is inconsistent to reconstruct the PIE active paradigm of what turned out as a sigmatic aorist/preterit in many branches by basing oneself essentially on the evidence of Indo-Iranian, and at the same time to deny the existence of a PIE sigmatic middle aorist altogether, because the joint evidence from Indo-Iranian and Greek precisely seems to attest to the existence of a PIE full-grade sigmatic middle aorist even more clearly than to the existence of a respective PIE active paradigm with generalized $\bar{e}$-vowel; see, above all, Narten, 1964, 23ff. (with ref.);[35] in favor of reconstructing root ablaut even within the active paradigm itself, see Peters, 1991a, 353vf., fn. 5. Accordingly, Ringe's explanation of the regular absence of palatalization in Tocharian B as due to analogical influence of respective middle forms (which he claims to have been both asigmatic and lacking full grade) is quite arbitrary. Furthermore, it is also problematic to assume that pre-PT *-CsmV- and *-CsrV- turned into PT *-CmV- and *-CrV- and *not* into *-CäsmV- and *-CäsrV-,[36] if one at the same time agrees that

---

[35] Winter, 1994a, 291f. = 2005, 472f. on the one hand accepts the existence of a PIE sigmatic middle aorist, but nevertheless claims that it showed zero grade of the root, "wenn der Befund des Altindischen den ursprünglichen Zustand widerspiegelt". Rasmussen, 2002, 381 does not go so far as to completely deny the existence of middle PIE *s*-aorists, but nevertheless regards the scarcity of middle forms of the Tocharian *s*-preterit as an archaism.

[36] Note, however, that according to Adams, 1988a, 38, even PT *-Vsm/nV- turned finally into -*Vm/nV-*; but his examples fail to convince. As a matter of fact, there should have existed an even stronger morpheme boundary

*-CstV- turned into *-CästV-, as Ringe indeed does. In addition, Ringe cannot explain Pt III paradigms showing a root vowel PIE = pre-PT *-ō- (see Peters, 2004, 434). Finally, as a consequence of Ringe's scenario, the many Sub I (and Sub V) formations with a (non-palatalizing) root vowel PT *æ would obviously have to be separated completely from the Pt III formations — note in this respect above all the 2.sg.act. Ipv III TA *ptas* from *ᴬtā(-s)-*. On the other hand, there is the fact that Pt III paradigms made from roots ending in a vowel show stem-final (*)-*sä*- indeed in all the forms that lack (*)-*s(ā)*- in Pt III paradigms made from roots ending in a non-syllabic other than -*s*-, exactly as to be expected from Ringe's point of view, but this evidence can be explained otherwise, as per Peters, 2006, 339f., fn. 25.

The second approach not recommended by the available evidence, in my opinion, is Adams' version of the *h₂e*-conjugation theory. I cannot see any need to derive the stem-final *ä*-vowel met immediately before the Pt III endings and the element (*)-*sā*- from any PIE vowel at all, and precisely the PIE *i-vowel proposed by Adams, 1994, to be the PIE ancestral vowel would have been a very unlikely candidate from a phonological point of view, see Malzahn, 2007, 241, fn. 15.

As for the other theories, I think it is only fair to say that different people will make different choices, according to their own general presuppositions and preferences with regard to the reconstruction of the PIE verbal system.

---

immediately after the *s*-morpheme as assumed by Ringe, so that one should have expected PT *-CäsämV- and *-CäsärV- to have been the final outcomes of the clusters pre-PT *-C+s+mV- and *-C+s+rV- as to be reconstructed on the basis of Ringe's scenario.

The *ṣṣā*-Preterit — Class IV

10.1. Synchronic Facts about Preterit Class IV

Preterit Class IV has a suffix -*ṣṣā*-/ TA -*ṣā*- and basically inflects like preterit Class I in both languages. The following 32 verbs form a Class IV preterit (27 TB, 13 TA, 8 TB = TA; only PPt: 6 TB, 8 TA, 2 TB = TA):

ār⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. II/ ᴬ*ār⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. II 'give up, abandon' (TA only PPt), *en*- 'instruct', *kātk*- Kaus. I/ ᴬ*kātk*- Kaus. I 'make glad' (only PPt), *kārp⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I/ ᴬ*kārp⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'make descend' (TA only PPt), *krāt²*- '± challenge' (only PPt), *kraup⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. IV 'let gather', *täp*- 'proclaim', *täm*- Kaus. I/ ᴬ*täm*- Kaus. I 'beget, generate' (TB only PPt), *nāsk*- Kaus. I 'bathe' (only PPt), *nitt⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'tear down', *naut⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'make disappear, destroy', *päk*- Kaus. I/IV 'let (?) cook' (only PPt), ᴬ*pyāṣt⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'make grow', ᴬ*plānt⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'make glad', *yāt⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. II 'enable, tame', *yām*-/ ᴬ*yām*- 'do' (TA only PPt), *läk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. IV/ ᴬ*läk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. IV 'make see, show', *wāk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. II 'let bloom', *wālts^ᵃ*- Kaus. IV 'let grind', *wāsk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'move away'/ ᴬ*wāsk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'stir up, let shake' (only PPt), *wänk*- '± prepare, offer (food)', ᴬ*wär*- 'smell' (only PPt), *winā-sk*-/ ᴬ*win-ās*- 'venerate, honor; confess', *śāw*- Kaus. III 'live', *soy*- Kaus. I 'satiate, satisfy', *stäm⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'put, place', ᴬ*spārtw⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'turn' (only PPt), *spāw⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'reduce', *swār⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'have pleasure in', *swās⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'let rain', *tsārw⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'comfort, console', ᴬ*tsāw*- '?' (only PPt). Uncertain is: ᴬ*täkw^ᵃ*- Kaus. ? '?' (Pt or Imp).

In the following paradigm all attestations of *yām*- are given:

	TB except *yām*-	*yām*-
1.sg.act.	*swāsäṣṣawa/swāṣṣawa*	*yamaṣṣawa/yamäṣṣāwa* (MQ)/*yāmṣawa/maṣṣawa*
2.sg.act.	*swāsäṣṣasta, soyṣasta*	*yamaṣṣasta/yamaṣasta/yāmṣasta*
3.sg.act.	*swāsäṣṣa, soyṣa*	*yamaṣṣa/yamaṣa/yāmṣa/maṣṣa*
1.pl.act.	*wāltsaṣam*	*maṣam*
2.pl.act.	—	*yāmṣaso*
3.pl.act.	*kraupäṣṣare, soyṣṣare, spāwäṣar*	*yamaṣṣare/yamaṣare/yāmṣare/ yamaṣṣar-me/yāmṣar* (M)/*maṣṣare*
1.sg.mid.	*tsārwäṣṣāmai* (MQ)	*yamaṣamai/yāmṣamai/yamṣamai* (MQ)
2.sg.mid.	*yātäṣṣatai* (MQ)	*yamaṣatai/yamäṣatai* (MQ)/*yāmṣatai*
3.sg.mid.	*tsārwäṣṣate, śāwṣate*	*yamaṣṣate/ yāmṣate*

1.pl.mid.	—	*yamaṣṣamnte*
2.pl.mid.	*swārāṣṣat*	*yamaṣat*
3.pl.mid.	*enāṣṣānte* (MQ), *śāwṣante*	*yamaṣṣante*
PPt	*yayātāṣṣu, ārskoṣ*	—

<div align="center">TA</div>

1.sg.act.	*lalākṣāwā*	1.sg.mid.	*pyāṣtṣe*
2.sg.act.	—	2.sg.mid.	—
3.sg.act.	*pyāṣtṣā-m*	3.sg.mid.	*pyāṣtṣāt*
1.pl.act.	—	1.pl.mid.	—
2.pl.act.	—	2.pl.mid.	—
3.pl.act.	—	3.pl.mid.	*pyāṣtṣānt, tatäṃṣānt*
PPt	*kākärpṣu*		

Pt IV formations belong to (pre-)PT suffixal (*)-*sk*- formations, and are therefore mostly (but not always) part of kausativum paradigms.

10.1.1. *Synchronic facts about Tocharian A*

TEB I, 252, § 447,5 lists the 1.sg. TA *lalākṣāwā* as the only attestation of a finite Pt IV formation in Tocharian A, which apparently shows reduplication. Another certain finite form with reduplication is now attested in YQ 44 a 4, i.e., the 3.pl.mid. TA *tatäṃṣānt-äṃ*. On the other hand, the YQ manuscript now provides us with five finite unreduplicated forms of a Class IV preterit made from the roots ᴬ*pyāṣt⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'make grow' and ᴬ*plant⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'make glad': 3.sg. TA *pyāṣtṣā-m*, 1.sg.mid. TA *pyāṣtṣe*, 3.sg.mid. TA *pyāṣtṣāt*, 3.pl.mid. TA *pyāṣtṣānt*, and 3.pl.mid. TA *plāntṣānt*. From this small pool of attestations one may draw the conclusion that only roots with non-full root vowel took on reduplication (TA *lalākṣāwā*, TA *tatäṃṣānt*), but those with full root vowel did not (TA *pyāṣtṣānt*, TA *plāntṣānt*); for an explanation, see chap. Pt II 8.1.3.

The PPt to be seen in TA *wawiṃṣuräṣ* from the root ᴬ*win-āṣ*- 'venerate' shows that stem-final TA -*āṣ*- was subject to weakening by vowel balance in a formerly five-syllabic form, cf. TEB I, 46, § 3,b. From this fact, TEB I, 252, § 447,3 draws the conclusion that the underlying suffix allomorph in a reduplicated finite form like 1.sg. TA *lalākṣāwā* was also rather *-āṣ*- than *-äṣ*-. As for the newly attested non-reduplicated finite forms from roots with full root vowel such as TA *plāntṣānt*, the deleted vowel again may either have been *-ä*- or *-ā*-. That Tocharian A in contrast to the usual TB Pt IV formations

based its Class IV preterits on stems in *-āṣ- is maybe supported by a non-reduplicated example which is, however, not too certain. This is TA *täkwāṣā* attested without much context in A 449 b 1 (TA *säm täkwāṣā* ////), and the restored 3.pl.mid. TA *(tä)kwāṣānt* in A 356 b 3. Both forms are analyzed as kausativum imperfects by TG, 439 and TEB II, 104, but both attestations are philologically completely unclear and the same is actually true for the forms that may belong to a grundverb of *^Atäkw^ä-*, so even a restoration to TA *(tä)kwāṣānt* is not too certain. I am, however, reluctant to simply analyze them as imperfects, because even non-full vowel roots lose A-character when forming a Class VIII present (witness, e.g., the 3.sg. Imp *wikṣā* from *^Awik^(ä)-* Kaus. II 'drive out'). On the other hand, if we have to do with a preterit of Class IV instead, at least TA *täkwāṣā* would be an example of an unreduplicated preterit made to a non-full vowel root and would thereby show preservation of A-character as was the case also even in the Class IX subjunctives forming part of TA kausativum paradigms, that is, it would suggest that in Tocharian A, the Class IV preterits were based on Sub IX stems.

10.1.2.   *Synchronic facts about Tocharian B*

10.1.2.1. *The 3.pl. active ending*

The 3.pl. active ending variant *-ār* is to be explained as an informal variant, because it is attested in eastern/informal texts both with and without following clitic: *wināṣṣar-ne* (bis, S), *yāmṣar* (M), *spāwäṣar* (letter), cf. Peyrot, 2008, 134. The fourth attestation *yamaṣṣar-me* from PK AS 18B b 4 may at first glance come from a standard literary text, but this manuscript also shows the informal variant *śitkāre* (see Peyrot, 2008, 225).

10.1.2.2. *Accent*

In order to determine the accent one has to distinguish between forms showing the suffix allomorph *-äṣṣā-* and forms where the *-ä-* (also coming from older *-ā-*) is syncopated; for the latter case see the discussion below 10.1.2.3. As for the non-syncopated forms, *yām-* 'do' and *win^ä-sk-* 'venerate' clearly show accent on the second syllable, i.e.,

regular accent (1.sg. *yamaṣṣawa* beside MQ *yamäṣṣāwa*),[1] whereas the other (non-MQ) examples of Pt IV show irregular initial accent: 1.sg. *swāsäṣṣawa*, 2.sg. *swāsäṣṣasta*, and 3.sg. *swāsäṣṣa* from *swās⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'let rain', etc. Since the Class IV preterits of both *yām-* and *winā-sk-* are grundverb formations, whereas the ones with initial accent form part of kausativum paradigms and are hence associated with likewise initially accented *sk*-presents and subjunctives, the initial accent certainly has to be viewed together with initial accent in the respective present/subjunctive.

10.1.2.3.   *Loss of A-character and loss of the (*)-ä-*

The secondary root *win^a-sk-* keeps A-character in the Class IV preterit while roots with A-character in the grundverb usually lose it in a Pt IV forming part of a kausativum paradigm (cf. TEB I, 252, § 447,3), in accordance with a general rule also to be observed in the respective present/subjunctive forms of the kausativum. And similarly to preservation of (*)-*ā*- in the respective present/subjunctive forms of Class IXb (for which see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.4.), stem-final -*ā*- is also preserved in two Pt IV forms: 2.sg. *naittaṣṣasta* from *nitt⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'tear down' in the eastern manuscript 297,1 b 5 and 1.pl. *wāltsaṣam* from *wālts^a-* Kaus. IV 'let grind', which is actually attested a couple of times in business documents.[2]

The (*)-*ä*- showing up as connecting vowel before the suffix -*ṣṣā*- (mostly a substitute for former (*)-*ā*-) can be deleted in metrical passages, as per Thomas, 1979, 175ff., cf., e.g., *enṣṣate-me* (Š) beside *enäṣṣänte* (MQ). Although Thomas' lists suggest that this kind of *ä*-deletion in the Pt IV is generally confined to metrical passages just like

---

[1] Note that the truncated informal forms of the type 1.sg. *maṣṣawa* etc. keep the accent of the fuller forms and do not shift it onto the suffix.

[2] In contrast to the Prs/Sub IXb forms showing preservation of -*ā*-, which mostly come from MQ texts or standard texts, the respective Pt IV forms with -*ā*- are attested in informal/eastern texts. The same is actually true for one of the two examples of preservation of -*ā*- from the Class IV imperative, i.e., *plāntaṣar-me* from *plānt⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'make glad' attested in a text from Dakianus; the similar Ipv IV *ptsārwaṣṣat-ne* from *tsārw⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'comfort' is, however, attested in 88 b 2, a text from Šorčuq. Since preservation of -*ā*- (and replacement by -*ä*-) in the Prs/Sub IXb and Pt IV certainly reflect the same phenomenon, I doubt that the confinement of the Pt IV forms with preserved (*)-*ā*- to informal texts is more than a hazard of text transmission. Note in this respect that Prs/Sub IXb forms are far more often attested than Pt IV forms.

the similar deletion of -*ä*- in the related present/subjunctive-stem suffix -*äske/äṣṣä*-, Thomas, 1979, 178, fn. 149 in addition states that *ä*-deletion in closed syllables is also sometimes attested "in Prosatexten", but he does not give any example from the Class IX present/subjunctive or Class IV preterit. There are indeed at least two such Pt IV forms to be found in prose texts, viz. the 3.sg.mid. *wänkṣāte-ne* in H 149.X 5 (= HMR 3) a 5, which may be a semantically unclear hapax, though it is certainly a Pt IV from a root *wänk-* '± prepare food'; and the 2.sg. *yāmṣasta* attested in a graffito (for which see Pinault, 1994a, 175f.). Since the latter is certainly an informal text, and informal forms may also have intruded into the Pratimokṣa text HMR 3, one will conclude that we have to do with allegro-style forms that could be used as metrical variants.[3] It is likely that the deletion is a consequence of simplification of the geminate -*ṣṣ*- to -*ṣ*- (which is certainly a progressive phonological development) leading to an open syllable, in which *ä* is syncopated regularly. Note that this (*)*ä* did in most cases not bear the accent, because a Class IV preterit acting as part of a kausativum paradigm in Tocharian B had initial accent. Things are different in the case of *yām*-, which had suffix accent in contrast to kausativum Pt IV forms. If -*ä*- is syncopated in a Pt IV form of *yām*-, standard texts show a writing like *yāmṣawa* as a variant of the respective regular form *yamaṣṣawa*, i.e., seem to indicate accent shift to the left. Thomas, 1979, 173 with fn. 122 pointed out that this apparent accent shift is unusual inasmuch as the metrical syncope of what formerly seems to have been an accented *á (of the type adj. *kätkre* 'deep' ← *kätkare*) usually does not lead to any accent shift indicated in writing at all; however, there are some parallels like *āstre/astare* 'pure', as adduced by Thomas as well. In general, the examples for metrical syncope as given by Thomas, 1979, passim seem to indicate that whenever an (*)*ä* that should have carried the accent by the TB basic rule of accentuation was syncopated, not any accent or pitch shift possibly resulting from that syncope was indicated in writing at all except in cases where the peak of the first syllable of the respective word had been constituted by an *ā-vowel in PT, which then would be rendered consistently by ⟨ā⟩. But note that, e.g., an underlying PT *āstäræ had to result in TB *āstre* also simply as a consequence of an application of the *pātär* accentuation rule (for

---

[3] The highly frequent verb *yām*- 'do' in addition shows a further reduced informal allomorph *mas*-, for which see Pinault, 1984a, 31; Schmidt, 1986a, 645ff.; Peyrot, 2008, 160ff.

which see chap. Sound Laws 1.3.), so that *āstre*, *yāmṣawa*, etc. need not to be taken for cases of *ắ*-syncope at all, but may simply attest to a preservation of the *pātär* rule.

Hence, the informal styles of Tocharian B in this preterit class sometimes prove more conservative (as in the cases of preservation of A-character and preservation of the *pātär* accentuation rule), and sometimes (as is more usual) more progressive (as in the case of degemination).

10.2. DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

As per TEB I, 176, § 300, kausativum paradigms from roots with non-full root vowel (*ä*, *i*, *u*) tend to have a preterit of Class II,[4] and those from roots with full root vowel (*ā*, *e*, *o*, *ai*, *au*) almost exclusively have a Class IV preterit. To be sure, the latter restriction makes perfect sense if the preterit Class II is ultimately to be derived from Narten root preterits with a (generalized) root vowel pre-PT *ē, because one should not expect pre-PT denominative present stems, deverbative present stems, and even apparent primary roots with another root vowel than pre-PT *e (such as pre-PT *sāi̯- 'satiate') to have formed a Narten root preterit with a root vowel pre-PT *ē in pre-PT at all.

Moreover, there are two such PPts found in standard texts: *tetanmäṣṣuwa* from *täm-* Kaus. I 'beget, generate', and *pepakṣu/ pepakṣoṣ* from *päk-* Kaus. I/IV 'let (?) cook'.

There can be no doubt that the Pt IV formations were derived from outcomes of pre-PT thematic present stems ending in suffixal *-sk-e/o-, and that they were coined on the model of the Pt I subtype *klyauṣa/* TA *klyoṣ*, much in the same way as all the preterits of Class V, and also most of the preterits of Class VII. On the other hand, there are some quite irregular forms such as the PPt *ārskoṣ* from *ār⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II 'abandon' or the imperative form 2.pl.act. *plakäskes* from *läk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. IV 'make see, show', pointing to an earlier stage when preterits to present stems in suffixal *-sk-e/o- were simply formed by attaching non-palatalizing pre-PT *-ā- to the suffix *-sk-; see chap. *tk*-Roots 32.2.

---

[4] For the few apparent exceptions, see my analysis given in chap. Pt II 8.1.1., fn. 2.

THE *ññā*-PRETERIT — CLASS V

11.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRETERIT CLASS V

The Class V preterit has the suffix *-ññā(-)* in both languages. In Tocharian B, there is only one finite preterit form attested, i.e., the 3.sg.mid. *kwipeññate* from *kwipe-ññ-* 'be ashamed'; in addition, *tänkw-ᵃññ-* 'love', *tsere-ññ-* 'deceive', and *tsk-ᵃññ-* 'mark, characterize' have PPt forms based on a Class V preterit stem. In Tocharian A, finite Class V preterit forms are attested slightly more often: from ᴬ*āks-* 'announce, proclaim' and ᴬ*oks-* 'grow, increase', while ᴬ*kāṣ-ⁱññ-* 'reprimand' only has a PPt again; ᴬ*kñā-ññ-* '± recognize, acknowledge' may supply further finite Pt V forms, but the forms in question may as well be imperfects. The preterit stem of ᴬᴮ*we-ñ-* 'say, speak' is also usually subsumed under this class, although we are dealing with a non-geminated *-ñ-* synchronically. The following forms are attested:

	TB	TA
1.sg.act.	*weñāwa*	*weñā*
2.sg.act.	*weñāsta*	*ākṣiñāṣt, weñāṣt*
3.sg.act.	*weña*	*ākṣiññā/ākṣñā-ṃ, okṣiññā-ci, we/weñā-ṃ*
1.pl.act.	*weñām*	*ākṣiññāmäs, weñāmäs*
2.pl.act.	*wñās*	*weñās*
3.pl.act.	*weñāre, wñāre, weñāre-neś* (S)*, weñār-mes* (S)*, weñār* (S)*, wñār-ne* (S)	*akṣiññār, weñār*
1.sg.mid.	—	—
2.sg.mid.	—	—
3.sg.mid.	*kwipeññate*	*kñāññāt*
1.pl.mid.	—	—
2.pl.mid.	—	—
3.pl.mid.	*weñānte*	*kñāññānt*
PPt	*tetaṅwañoṣ, tsetserñu, tsetskäññoṣ*	*kākṣiñu*

In Tocharian B, the Class V preterit basically inflects like a Class I preterit of the *klyauṣa* type. Loss of the final *-e* in the 3.pl.act. ending as seen in *weñār-mes* is not alien to other preterit classes inflecting like Pt I as well, cf. chap. Pt I 7.2.1.

In Tocharian A, the Pt V forms rather conform to the model of the imperfects of the *klyoṣā* type, with the notable exception of the 3.sg. Pt variant TA *we* < **wen* < **weñā* of ^A*we-ñ-*, which has the shape of a Pt I form and in addition shows irregular loss of word-final **-n*, on which see Winter, 1977, 155f. = 2005, 191f.

The vowel TA *-i-* that stands in front of *-ññ-* can be syncopated in metrical passages just like the *-i-* in the Class XII present stems (where such a syncope is attested far more often), cf. the 3.sg. TA *ākṣñā* beside TA *ākṣiññā* (see TG, 380, § 457, fn. 2.).

11.2. DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

A Class V preterit in *-ññā(-)* is in both languages nearly always associated with a Class XII subjunctive (with the exception of the special case of ^{AB}*we-ñ-*). As for the respective present stems, Tocharian B only has such Prs XII stems attested beside a Pt V, while in Tocharian A the roots ^A*āks-* and ^A*oks-* have a present of Class XI. Note that from ^A*oks-* there is still an *ññ*-less PPt TA *okṣu* to be found, which forms an equation with TB *aukṣu* and shows that the preterit stem in *-ññā(-)* made from that root is certainly an innovation, cf. Winter, 1977, 138 = 1984, 183 = 2005, 175.

The Class V preterit in *-ññā(-)* as a whole is no doubt a secondary creation based on corresponding thematic subjunctive/present stems in *-ññ-*, and furthermore on the model provided by the *ā*-preterits of the *klyauṣa*/TA *klyoṣ* type. As for the fact that in Tocharian A (with the excpetion of TA *we*) all 3.sg. active forms and also the 2.sg.act. TA *weñāṣt* look like Imp III and not like Pt I forms, it was assumed by Van Windekens (VW II/2, 181) that "certains prétérits en *-ññ-* reposent sur d'anciens imparfaits". What we will really have to assume is rather analogical influence exerted by the respective imperfect forms, which is quite plausible given the fact that there is just one single finite Class V preterit form attested in Tocharian B at all, but at least seven imperfects made to a respective present stem in *-ññ-*,[1] which is very remarkable, because preterit forms are in general

---

[1] It is even possible that there are more than seven such imperfects, because the 2.sg.mid. *añmaññītar* and 3.sg.mid. *añmaññitär* from *āñm-ᵃññ-*

more frequently used in texts than imperfect forms. A similar disproportion between Class V preterits and respective imperfects is also to be seen in Tocharian A, although there are slightly more finite Pt V forms attested than in Tocharian B. These finite Pt V forms of Tocharian A, however, all seem to belong to deverbative *iññ*-stems ("secondary deverbatives" as per Hilmarsson). There is not one single finite Pt V form from an indubitable denominative *iññ*-stem attested in Tocharian A, whereas there are no less than four imperfects from such denominative Prs XII stems.[2] Of course, this is not surprising since the original aorists > preterits made to denominative present stems all turned out as Class I preterits.

'wish', and the 3.sg.mid. *arcäññītär* from *ārc(-ᵃññ)-* 'should' can be either Imp or Opt.

[2] All four forms are syntactically assured imperfects.

THE THEMATIC PRETERIT — CLASS VI

12.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRETERIT CLASS VI

Only two roots form a Class VI preterit: *käm-/ ^Akum-* 'come', *lä-n-t-/ ^Alä-n-t-* 'go out'. The variation 3.sg. *śemo*, 3.sg. *śema-ñ*,[1] and 3.sg. *śem-neś*[2] points to PT *śæmä(-), i.e., a PT 3.sg. ending *-ä, and the same is true for *läca-ne* and *läc-o* (MQ, archaic ductus). It is remarkable that these preterit paradigms did not introduce the ubiquitous preterit suffix *-ā(-)* (even the informal 3.pl. variant *śemare* reminiscent of TA *lcär* probably does not show *-ā- but *-ä-). A word-final mobile *-o* for former *-ä in a similar context shows up in the 3.sg. Imp *ṣeyo* 'was' and *yeyo* 'went'. The 3.sg. *yaśa-c* (MQ) as read by Schmidt, 1997a, 258ff. and 2. or 3.sg. *yāś* would fit here as well (PPt *yāku*, *yākoṣ*), but both finite preterit forms are philologically uncertain, see s.v. *yok-* 'drink'.

	käm-	*^Akum-*	*lä-n-t-*	*^Alä-n-t-*
1.sg.	*kamau*[3]	—	*latau*	*lcā*
2.sg.	*śem*[4]	—	*lac*[5]	—

---

[1] Attested in H 149.234 b 1 (no MQ character); cf. also *śema-c* in THT 1541 frg. h a 1 (no MQ character).

[2] Here the *-ä- is syncopated either as a result of Klingenschmitt's rule (1994, 372 = 2005, 403, fn. 107) or of the *pātär* accentuation rule (see chap. Sound Laws 1.3.).

[3] TEB I, 254, § 453 lists the form without ref., while WTG does not mention it at all. Consequently, many scholars doubted its existence, the more since it is an etymologically unexpected form (thus, e.g., Hackstein, 1995, 164, 21; Winter, 1999, 260; Kim, 2001, 122, fn. 8). However, a 1.sg. Pt *kamau* seems indeed attested sentence-finally in the small fragment THT 1615 frg. a b 2 (MQ): *ecce kamau •* "I came hither" (cf. also Peyrot, 2008, 136).

[4] A certain 2.sg. *śem* is attested in PK NS 48 + 258 a 3 (see Pinault, 1994, 184ff.). There is some discussion about other attestations of a 2.sg. form of this paradigm, and it starts with Winter's restoration of a 2.sg. *(śem)t* in Man.Bil. 23 (in Gabain/Winter, 1958, 26); later, however, Winter, 1999, 260 restored to *(kam)t*; likewise Adams, 1988a, 94 ("*kamt(o)*"; but he does not list such a form anymore in DoT, 161) and Kim, 2001, 122, fn. 9. To be sure, the remainder of

	käm-	^A*kum-*	*lä-n-t-*	^A*lä-n-t-*
3.sg.	*śem/śemo/* *śema-ñ/ śem-neś*	—[6]	*lac/laiś* (S)/*laś/* *läco/läca-ne*	*läc/lcā-ṃ*
1.pl.	*kmem*	—	—	—
2.pl.	—	—	*latso*	—
3.pl.	*kameṃ/* *kmeṃ-ne/śemare*	—	*lateṃ*	*lcär*
3.du.	—	—	*ltais*	—
PPt	*kekamu/ kekamoṣ*	*kakmu*	*ltu/ ltuweṣ*	*laltu/lantu/lalntu*

12.2. DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

It is communis opinio that the preterit of *lä-n-t-* continues a thematic (or thematized) PIE aorist 1.-3.sg. $*h_1lud^h$-o-m, $*h_1lud^h$-e-s, $*h_1lud^h$-e-t, 3.pl. $*h_1lud^h$-o-nt, as was at first stated by Pedersen, 1941, 189. Such thematic looking 2. and 3.sg. forms are directly continued in PT *lät'ä

---

the form has rather to be read *-r*, not *-t*, see now Pinault, 2008a, 99f., who proposes to restore *(ko)r* 'myriad'.

[5] On the ghost form 2.sg. *lät* (as per WTG, 283; TEB I, 254, § 453,2), see s.v. *lä-n-t-*.

[6] Whether the form TA *kmāṃ* "aus übriggebliebenen kleinen Fragmenten" (as per TochSprR(A), 222, ad no. 399-404) can be analyzed as a 3.sg. Pt TA *kmā-ṃ* (as proposed in TG, 429) corresponding to the TB Pt VI is highly questionable. The form is, in my opinion, to be found in the unpublished fragment THT 1411 frg. c a 4: //// *[ā/o]ṛant̩ kmāṃ [w](·)* ////. Although the context is totally unclear, it is at least likely that TA *kmāṃ* is indeed a separate word. However, I doubt that we are dealing here with a preterit of this root. As Schmidt, 1974, 58, fn. 1 has pointed out it is a quite remarkable fact that no (certain) finite forms of the preterit of this root are attested at all in Tocharian A, in contrast to over 50 attestations of finite forms of this root outside the preterit. One has to conclude that the finite preterit of this root was given up in Tocharian A, which may precisely be due to the fact that it may have had an irregular paradigm. Strangely enough, there is no suppletive preterit stem from 'come' to be found either. It rather seems that the preterit forms have been replaced by the periphrastic construction PPt TA *kakmu* + copula (a construction that is indeed attested very often), or perhaps also by the imperfect of the same root (cf. TA Imp *kumṣār* A 312 b 6, where one would indeed rather expect a preterit than an imperfect form syntactically; a different explanation for the imperfect in this passage is given by Thomas, 1957, 21, fn. 1).

> TB *lac*, TA *läc*,[7] whereas the 1.sg. and the 3.pl. has a different ending in Tocharian A.

The preterit paradigm of *käm-/* [A]*kum-* is to be derived from a PIE root aorist (rather than from a PIE *s*-aorist *gʷēmst) that was secondarily thematized in analogy with the preterit paradigm of semantically similar *lä-n-t-* 'go out' (see Pinault, 1994, 193, fn. 122; Hackstein, 1995, 164; Kim, 2001, 124f.; Widmer, 2001, 184). As for the pre-PT *ē-vowel, Adams, 1978, 282 with fn. 24 sets up a lengthened-grade *gʷēm-et of the "long-vowel aorist" type to be seen in the Tocharian type *lyāka*, TA *lyāk*, etc. and in the cognate Lat. *vēnit*; but see chap.s Pt I 7.3.7. and Imp 15.3.2. on these forms. Although there is no evidence for an *s*-aorist from the PIE root *√gʷem in any other IE language, the Tocharian preterit has been derived from such an *s*-aorist in order to explain the apparent lengthened grade of the preform of 3.sg. *śem*, e.g., by Schmidt, 1997a, 257f. Differently, Winter, 1999, 259ff. speculates about thematic *gʷemet turning into *gʷēmt by sound law, which is rightly rejected as *ad hoc* by Kim, 2001, 124, fn. 14, and the same has to be said about Winter's first proposal of an injunctive *gʷemt turning to *k'æm by a sound law PIE *e > PT *æ in monosyllables (see Kim, 2001, 123f. with ref.). The *-ē- was here rather analogically introduced into the paradigm from the 1.sg. root aorist **gʷem-m that developed into *gʷēm by sound law (see Schindler apud Hollifield, 1977, 170; Jasanoff, 1991, 97, fn. 28; Pinault, 1994, 190ff.; Kim, 2001, 125ff.).[8]

---

[7] Kim, 2001, 120, fn. 3 following Cardona, 1960, 104 argues that TA 3.sg. *läc* is not the direct continuant of PT *läc, because "the TA form is underlying /lc-ā/" judging by TA *lcā-ṃ* with enclitic pronoun "parallel to *tāka-ṃ* from *tāk*". Apparently, we do not have the stem vowel *-ä-* as in TB, but an *ā*-stem. A simple analogy with the *ā*-preterit is, nevertheless, not likely because the 3.pl. TA *lcär* does not display the regular Pt I ending *-ār*. Kim, 2001, 121, fn. 6 seems to think that *läc-är* is simply analogous after 3.pl. Pt I forms like *tāk-ar* (but I do not see how the quoted ablauting form *stam-ār* could have furnished a basis for the introduction of *-är*). TA *lcär* actually may be an archaism (except the *-c-*, of course) if alleged PIE "*h₁ludʰ-e-t" had started out as an athematic middle form in *-e.

[8] Kim proposes to extend this law to all instances of pre-PIE **-VRC in order to explain the lengthened grade also met in the 2.sg. and 3.sg. Toch. aorist forms from *gʷem by sound law rather than analogy; however, if this really was an operating sound law, we would expect many more examples of such lengthened grades. As for the 2.sg. active, which certainly must have been far less important than the 1.sg. and the 3.sg. forms, *-VRs should have

As for the antevocalic stem allomorph *käm-* to be seen in the plural and 1.sg., one can take *käm-* to be the reflex of a Lindeman variant *g^{u}m̥- → *k^{w}äm- (see Pinault, 1994, 195f.). Note that Kim, 2001, 132, fn. 34 proposes as an alternative the insertion of a prop vowel in order to split the initial *km- < *g^{u}m-, but Tocharian does not seem to have problems with initial consonant clusters of that kind otherwise. On the other hand, the stem allomorph *käm-* has been taken to be analogical after semantically related *lät-* (see Hackstein, 1995, 164, fn. 21 and Widmer, 2001, 185; one may ask, however, why *käm-* should have acquired an irregular paradigm with respect to the root initial and root ablaut, while in the preterit paradigm of *lä-n-t-* the root initial and root ablaut do not alter).

Finally, I propose that we may also have an analogical Class VI 3.pl. form *maiteṃ* in 484, 5 (MQ) from *mit$^{(a)}$-* 'set out, go, come'. WTG, 268 analyzed it as a nominal form, but I rather follow Adams, DoT, 461, who takes it to be a (Prs I/II) verbal form from this root. However, instead of a present a preterit is more likely in this passage, which comes from a monastery record: *piś meñantse-ne maiteṃ kalā* //// "on the fifth (day) of the month they set out ...". It is conceivable that a 3.pl. Pt *maiteṃ* 'they went' was simply created in analogy after the 3.pl. Pt *kameṃ* 'they came'; as for the semantics, note that the regular 3.pl. preterit *maitare* in 108 a 3 has also end-terminative meaning, i.e., is synonymous with *kameṃ* (see the translation of the passage by Carling, 2000, 89: "als sie an die Stelle, an der sie sein sollten, kamen [wtl. gingen]").

---

indeed resulted by sound law in *-V̄R, as correctly pointed out by Nussbaum apud Jasanoff, 1991, 97, fn. 28.

THE *iyā*-PRETERIT — CLASS VII

13.1.   SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRETERIT CLASS VII

According to the manuals, this preterit class is only attested in Tocharian B; however, there may be at least one TA example to be found. A preterit of this class has to be set up for at least the following nine roots:

ākl- 'learn', *auks-* 'grow' (only PPt), *kärś-* 'chop up' (only PPt), *kälyp-* 'steal', *krās⁽ᵃ⁾-* act. 'vex', mid. 'be angry', *pruk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'overlook, neglect', *lāl-* 'exert oneself', *wäs-* 'dwell, abide', *śāw-* 'live'. Probably to be added to this list: *sārˀ-*/ ᴬ*sārˀ-* 'plant'.

The following forms are attested:

1.sg.act.	*kälypawa/kälypīyawa,* *wṣeyawa* (S)	1.sg.mid.	*aklyīyamai/aklyamai*
2.sg.act.	*lalyyasta*	2.sg.mid.	*aklyyatai*
3.sg.act.	*kälwiya, pruśiya/pruśya,* *lalyīya, wṣīya, śawiya*	3.sg.mid.	*aklyyate, kraṣīyate,* (*saryate* MQ)?

PPt	*āklu/ ākloṣ, aukṣu, kekarśwa, kekalypoṣ, peprukweṣ, lalālu/* *lalāloṣ, auṣu, śaśayu* (Š)*/ śaśāyoṣ*

In Tocharian B there is a monosyllabic suffix variant *-yā(-)* confined to metrical passages, and these apparently syncopated forms behave with respect to accent like most of those other forms that seem to have undergone metrical syncope of what looks like accented *á (in open syllable), i.e., like *kätkre* from *kätkare*; see the discussion by Winter, 1990, 377 = 2005, 399. As for *-eyā-* in *wṣeyawa* attested in 591, this text hails from Sängim; now a raising of /e/ to /i/ and an inverse writing of ⟨e⟩ instead of ⟨i⟩ reminiscent of *wṣeyawa* is precisely a feature of the eastern and informal varieties of Tocharian B, especially in palatal environment; see Klingenschmitt, 1992, 100f. = 2005, 313f. and most recently Peyrot, 2008, 59f.[1] Accordingly, there is no need for taking

---

[1] In addition, there are also some attestations to be found in non-eastern, formal texts even in non-palatalized environment: *leleyu* for †*leliyu* in 33 (Š),

wṣeyawa to be an instance of a sound change PT *-īyā- > *-æyā-, as has been done by Peters, 2006, 346. On the other hand, the mere fact that *-ĭya(-)* does vary with *-ya(-)* certainly does not recommend a derivation from (pre-)PT *-īy- rather than from pre-PT *-i̭- > PT *-äy-.

The metrical 3.pl.mid. *saryate* has been analyzed as a Pt VII by Winter, 1990, 377 = 2005, 399. It is the only attested verbal form of its root in Tocharian B, while Tocharian A has the preterit forms: 3.sg.act. TA *sāryā*, 3.sg.mid. TA *sāryāt*, 3.pl.mid. TA *sāryānt*, and PPt TA *sāsäryu*. The lack of weakening by vowel balance in Tocharian A can indeed neatly be explained by setting up a former trisyllabic sequence *sār-äyā- > TA *sāryā-*, as per Winter, 1994, 401ff. = 2005, 450ff.; on the other hand, *-y-* would have to be a very late intruder in the PPt.

13.1.1. *Function*

The manuals call this preterit "Durativum" (WTG, 153, §§ 154f.), or "Intensiv-Präteritum" (TEB I, 179, § 306; VW II/2, 187f., § 241). In contrast, Winter, 1961, 89ff. = 1984, 160 = 2005, 28ff. reasonably argues that none of these forms has a durative or intensive meaning, but that they are normal preterits systematcally connected with a subjunctive of Class IV in *-i-* and with an *sk*-present of Class IXa.[2] As a matter of fact, a Sub IV is indeed attested from:

ākl- 'learn' (tr) (-/m/m) (IXa/IV/VII); *auks-* 'grow' (itr) (a/?/-) (XI/IV/PPt); *kärś-* 'chop up' (tr) (a/a/-) (IXa/IV/PPt), *kälyp-* 'steal' (tr) (-/a/a) (IXa/IV/VII); *lāl-* 'exert oneself' (itr) (a+/a/a) (IXa/IV/VII); *wäs-* 'dwell' (itr) (a+/a/a) (IXa/IV/VII).

On the other hand, no Sub IV is found from:

krās[a]- act. 'vex', mid. 'be angry' (tr/itr) (m/-/x) (IV/-/I-VII); *pruk[a]-* Antigv. 'overlook' (tr) (m/-/a) (VIII/-/III-VII);[3] *śāw-* 'live' (itr) (a+/a/a) (II/II/I-VII).

---

iñcwo for *eñcwo*, *āktike* instead of *ākteke* (*e* being older; see Peyrot, 2008, 171f.), *inte* for *ente* (Peyot, 2008, 172), and probably *tiri* 'way, manner' vs. *teri* attested in 108 a 7 (S) and in a monastery record (see Pinault, 1984a, 24; Peyrot, 2008, 161f.). One must conclude that the raising of *e* to *i* especially in palatal environment was an informal-style feature that could only very sporadically appear in standard texts.

[2] As for *krās[a]-*, *pruk[a]-*, and *śāw-*, Winter seems to suggest that from these roots there once existed the same kind of paradigms, but see immediately below.

[3] Pt III is presupposed by the PPt (on which see the discussion in chap. PPt 14.1.1.1.), and by the paradigmatic affiliation.

Whereas one may feel free to assume that the first two of these roots had a Sub IV as well, such a strategy would be quite arbitrary for *śāw-*, which, however, had a very interesting Pt I in what probably was PT monosyllabic *-yā-; see the end of the next paragraph.

13.2.   DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

The first to give this preterit type a diachronic analysis has been Couvreur, 1947, 65, § 109,b. Basing himself on the teachings of Sieg, who called the type "durative", Couvreur thought the preterit suffix *-ā-* had been added to imperfect stems in (as he seems to assume) a short *-i-, with *-iyā-* as a result (similarly WTG, 153, § 154). Winter, 1961, 89ff. = 1984, 160 = 2005, 28ff.; 1994a, 295ff. = 2005, 476ff. rightly rejected the view that these preterits had a "durative" or "intensive" function, and further claimed a common origin of the *iyā*-preterits and the TA imperfect of Class III; the most striking innovation by Winter, however, probably was that he did not derive these formations from proto-forms with *-iy-, but from pre-PT ancestor forms ending in *-ēi̯ē-. Peters, 2004, 432f., fn. 19 and 2006, 346 rejected setting up *-ēi̯ē-, but somehow adopted the other new aspects of Winter's analysis, deriving both Pt VII and the TA imperfect forms of Class III from PT forms in *-īyā- with a *long* *-ī-, and claiming that this suffix consisted of "Imperfekt- = Optativmorphem *-ī- + Präteritalmorphem *-ā-".

   There exists also another recent approach somehow in the same spirit as that of Winter and Peters, that made by Kim in a yet unpublished paper:[4] according to that paper, not only Pt VII and TA Imp III, but also the *klyauṣa*-type Pt I forms are to be derived from one single morphological category, viz. optatives turned into preterits and then enlarged by the preterit suffix PT *-ā-; however, Kim reverted to setting up PT *-äyā-, and did not take into consideration (pre-)PT *-īy-. In order to get to both Pts VII and *klyauṣa*-type Pts I (as well as TA Imps III), he claimed there existed a sound law according to which accented schwa vanishes after "(palatal?) coronal consonant" (hence *kl'æwṣ-ā́yā- → *klyauṣa*), but remained after non-coronal consonants (hence *kälyp'-ä-yā- → *kälpiyawa/kälpyawa*). However, the problem with this sound law is that it simply does not work: there are three roots ending in *-s-* that do have a Pt VII, whereas the Pt I

---

[4] Lecture given on 11 Jun 2003 at Harvard University, to be published in MSS; see also Kim, 2003, 194, fn. 6.

made from *cämp-* behaves completely differently from the Pt VII made from *kälyp-* (see chap. Pt I 7.3.9.).

In my opinion, there can be no doubt that most[5] of the Pt VII forms were derived from Sub IV stems, viz. by addition of the ubiquitous preterit suffix PT *-ā- to a subjunctive stem (originating itself in a former present stem), and thereby built much in the same way as the Pt IV and Pt V formations (cf. Pinault, 2008, 589f.).[6] The fact that in the Pt VII we evidently have to do with PT *-äyā-, and not with PT *-īyā-, of course, strongly suggests that the Sub IV stems themselves ended in PT *-äy-, and not in PT *-īy-. To be sure, it is indeed best to derive the Subs IV (basically) from *i̯e/o*-presents, in the paradigms of which PT *-Cy'äC(-) may have turned into *-C'äyC(-), see chap. Sub IV.[7] As for the Pt VII form *śawiya* from *śāw-*, however, a different solution is evidently both necessary and also possible: the Pt I form *śāya* attested beside Pt VII *śawiya* is best explained as regular standard-language result of a PT *śāwyā > *śāw'ā; one could then venture the guess that Pt VII *śawiya* is the regular outcome of that PT *śāwyā in the most formal styles.

---

[5] Note that with respect to *krās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'vex, be angry', there could have easily existed a denominative present in pre-PT *-i-i̯e/o- derived from a pre-PT ō-grade abstract in pre-PT *-i- (as per Peters, forthc.). For the former existence of a Sub IV from the root met in *saryate*, etc., see Kim, 2007a, 50f.

[6] Similarly, but within a quite different framework, Klingenschmitt, 1994, 407 = 2005, 432, fn. 165.

[7] This then would imply, of course, that the *-(i)y-* of Pt VII had nothing to do at all with the optative (> imperfect) marker -ĭ-.

THE PRETERIT PARTICIPLE

14.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT THE PRETERIT PARTICIPLE

In general, every form of a Tocharian preterit participle can be used both actively and passively, both transitively and intransitively (cf. WTG, 34, § 29). The PPt constitutes a special stem within the averbo. Usually, it is synchronically correlated with a preterit stem built from the same root, but may nevertheless differ from that preterit stem somehow (cf. Pinault, 1989, 127), because non-finite verbal forms in general tend to be more conservative than finite verbal forms (see, e.g., Peters, 1991, 521, 618). However, it is still reasonable to arrange the PPt forms according to their affiliation with preterit classes. The following types presented here schematically can be observed: [1]

	TB	TA	PT
Pt I			
Subclasses 1-4	CäC-ówä/o > °-ôṷ, °-au, -óṣ(ä/o)	CäC-o	*CäC-åwä
Subclass 5	Cā-CāC-au, -aṣ	*Cā-CāC-u[2]	*Cæ-CāC-āwä
Subclass 7	C'e-C'äC-u, -oṣ	—	*C'æ-C'äC-äwä
Cä/æC- Pt I+pal. [3]	Ce-Cä/æC'-u, -oṣ	*Ca-CäC'-u	*Cæ-Cä/æC'(y)-äwä
CāC- Pt I+pal.	Cā-CāC'-u, -oṣ	*Cā-CāC'-u[2]	*Cæ-CāC'(y)-äwä
Pt II			
roots with root vowel (*)ä only	C'e-C'äC-u, -oṣ	(*)C'a-C'äC-u	*C'æ-C'äC-äwä

---

[1] For simplicity's sake, CäC- denotes here C(C)äC[C(C)]-, and CāC- denotes [C(C)]āC[C(C)]-.

[2] PT *-āyC-, *-āwC- turned into TA -eC-, -oC-, but PT *-āRC- into TA -äRC-, and PT *-CāCV- into TA -CCV; see below 14.1.2.

[3] In TA, only CæC- seems to be involved.

Pt III

CäC-/CäC⁽ᵃ⁾-	Ce-CäC-u, -oṣ(o)/ Ce-CeC-u, -oṣ/ C'e-C'äC-u, -oṣ	(*)Ca-CäC-u/ (*)C'a-C'äC-u	*Cæ-CäC-äwä/ *Cæ-CæC-äwä/ *C'æ-C'äC-äwä
CāC-/CāC⁽ᵃ⁾-	Cā-CāC-u, -oṣ	(*)Cā-CāC-u²	*Cæ-CāC-äwä
Subtype without reduplication	CäC-u, -uweṣ	—	*CäC-äwä

Pt IV

CäC-/CäC⁽ᵃ⁾-	Ce-R-ṣṣ-u, -oṣ	Ca-R-ṣ-u	*Cæ-R-sk'(y)-äwä
CāC-/CāC⁽ᵃ⁾-	Ce-R-ṣṣ-u, -oṣ [ārskoṣ]	Ca-R-ṣ-u	*Cæ-R-sk'(y)-äwä

Pt V

all kinds of roots	Ce-R-ññ-u, -oṣ	Ca-R-ññ-u	*Cæ-R-ññ-äwä

Pt VII

CäC-	Ce-CäC('[y])-u, -oṣ	—	*Cæ-CäC('[y])-äwä
CāC-	Cā-CāC('[y])-u, -oṣ	—	*Cæ-CāC('[y])-äwä

Pt 0

CäC-	—	*Ca-CäC-u	*Cæ-CæC-äwä
ᴬᴮlä-n-t-	ltu/ -uweṣ	laltu/lalntu/ lantu	*lätäwä
yām-	yāmu, -oṣ	yāmu	*(y'ä-)yām-äwä
yok-	yāku, -oṣ		

This rather complex picture can basically be reduced to four main types. These differ with respect to the presence or absence of reduplication and with respect to the endings. For the phonological development of the endings I basically follow Þórhallsdóttir, 1988, 184ff. (with discussion of the older literature).

14.1.1.   Tocharian B

14.1.1.1. Basically non-reduplicated PPts in -u, -uweṣ

Nom.sg. PT *-áwä (mostly from pre-PT *-äu̯ōs) > -ú
Obl. PT *-áwæs'ä > *-ú-wæṣ-ä > -úweṣ(o)

The following forms (arranged according to the respective preterit classes) are attested:

Pt I: For *śeśu, seśuwer* from *śuwᵃ̣-* 'eat' see below.

Pt III: *ku-* 'pour': *kuwermeṃ; täṅk-* 'hinder': *täṅkuweṣ; putk-* 'shut': *putkuweṣ; plätk-* 'overflow': *plätku* (S)/ *plätkweṣ* (MQ); *plutk-* '± arise?': *plutku*. Although there are no finite preterit forms attested from *täṅk-, putk-,* and *plutk-,* there is reason to believe that these roots indeed formed an *s*-preterit. As for *puttuwer* from *pätt²-* '± climb', there is otherwise only an ambiguous present form of Class II or III attested from this root, but it may belong to this same PPt class, i.e., may have had a paradigm consisting of Prs II and Pt III. The same may be true for *litku* 'averted', if this is indeed a PPt from *litk⁽ᵃ⁾²-* 'remove'; see the discussion s.v. *litk⁽ᵃ⁾²-* 'remove'. Finally, isolated PPt *snätku* from a root *snätk-* 'suffuse' shows the same kind of PPt formation. Note that both *plätku* and *snätku* clearly show that the accent in standard Tocharian B still is on the ending. I suggest that the reduplicated PPt *peprukweṣ* from *pruk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'overlook' belongs here as well. Although this paradigm shows a preterit of Class VII, an *s*-preterit would be expected in an antigrundverb paradigm of that kind, so a PPt †*pruku, -uweṣ* could have been the respective PPt of that (non-attested) former *s*-preterit stem, which later may have taken on reduplication after the Pt VII came into being by analogy with reduplicated PPt forms standing beside Pt VII stems such as *kekalypoṣ* from *kälyp-* 'steal'.

Pt VI: *lä-n-t-* 'go out': *ltu, ltuweṣ.*

yku, ykuweṣ from *i-* 'go' has a suppletive, *k*-extended stem, which may owe the stem-final *-k-* to a semantically opposed PT stem *tāk- 'stand; stand still', which can be reasonably reconstructed as the ancestor of *tāk(ā)- 'be, become' (but note that the more regular PPt †*ynu* is attested by the derivative *ynūca* 'going').

Three stems ending in *-uw-* seem to belong here descriptively, but have an *-u-* in front of the *-w-* which does not go back to a pre-PT prop vowel *ä that developed *e nihilo* between a stem-final non-syllabic and a desinence-initial non-syllabic: In *kuw-*, the *-u-* goes back to pre-PT *-u-, just as the first of the three *ä vowels in unreduplicated PT *lätäwä (> *ltu*).[4] In *śeśu, śeśuwer* belonging to the Pt I from *śuwᵃ̣-* 'eat', and also in the old PPt form *säsuwa*, which synchronically acts as the nom.pl. form of *soy* 'son' (for the etymology, see Winter, 1985, 260f. = 2005, 288f.; Ringe, 1991, 74), things are completely different, because in the first of these two participles, *-uw-* clearly goes back somehow to a PIE sequence *-uH-u̯-, and the second form seems to be

---

[4] Note that there is no reduplicated variant †*kekuw-*.

a plural form that belonged to a neuter nom.acc.sg. PIE *se-suH-us > pre-PT *sesūs. It is not so clear whether -uw- in śeśuwer goes back to pre-PT *-ūu̯- directly, or rather to a proto-form with a sequence pre-PT *-u/äu̯au̯o- > PT *-äwāwæ- that eventually turned into Late PT *-äwæ- by Winter's rule (1965, 204 = 2005, 120), by which unstressed PT *-wāwV turned into -wV, and could also have applied in sₐsuwa. Since all these forms have a preserved reduplication syllable, according to my views on reduplication presented below, I would strongly prefer not to derive them from forms with a pre-PT sequence *-u/äu̯au̯-, but to have them based on forms with preserved pre-PT *-ū- in the syllable that followed the reduplication syllable. Winter's somewhat surprising reduction rule may then have started out not as a phonological rule, but rather may have had a morphological origin, viz. may rather have been deduced precisely from forms such as śeśuwer showing a sequence -uwe- developed directly out of pre-PT *-ūu̯o- rather than the *-(u)wawe- from PT *-äwāwæ- that one should have expected synchronically on account of the otherwise almost ubiquitous root/stem-final PT *-ā-.

14.1.1.2. *Reduplicated PPts in -u, -oṣ(o)*

Nom.sg. PT *-äwä (almost always from pre-PT *-äu̯ōs) > -u, -wä[5]
Obl. PT *-äwæs'ä > -oṣ, -oṣo

Due to reduplication, the connecting vowel *-ä- did not bear the accent, so that the development of the suffix/ending was different from that in Class 1.

This formation is the most productive one for roots without A-character. It is regularly met not only with Class III preterits, but also with the *klyauṣa*-type preterits and with the somewhat similar preterit classes Pt IV, Pt V, and Pt VII, which accordingly all lose stem-final -ā- in these PPts:

Pt I: Subgroup 1: Roots without A-character that form a Pt I with palatalized root final of the type *kātk-* 'rejoice': *kakāccu/ kakāccoṣ.* The reduplication vowel PT *æ can be subject to ā-umlaut or umlaut by *å: *kātk-* 'rejoice': *kakāccu/ kakāccoṣ*; *nāsk-* 'bathe': *nanāṣṣūsa*; *pāsk-* 'protect': *papāṣṣu/ papāṣṣoṣ*; *yāsk-* 'beg': *yayāṣṣoṣ*; *lāṃs-* 'perform': *lalāṃṣuwa/ lalāṃṣaṣ* (sic; most likely a misspelling); here also belongs *āks-* 'announce': *ākṣu/ ākṣoṣ* (and probably *aukṣu* from *auks-* 'grow' from which no preterit is attested, but which may have

---

[5] *peprutkwä* in 139 b 8 (MQ) in pāda-final position.

had a Pt VII for structural reasons); these roots must, of course, lack reduplication. The reduplication vowel -*e*- is preserved in *kärsk*- 'shoot': *kekarṣṣu* (if the root is set up correctly at all), and also in *klyaus*- 'listen': *keklyauṣu/ keklyauṣoṣ*.[6] Finally, *soy*- 'become sated' *sosoyu/ sosoyoṣ* shows umlaut by following *å. See also Winter, 1977, 136ff. = 1984, 181ff. = 2005, 173ff.

Subgroup 2: Roots that form a Pt I of Subclass 7 (with persistent (*)-*ā*- in the root and palatalized root initial): *pälw*ᵃ- 'lament': 3.sg. *plyāwa*, PPt *pepälyworsa*; *läk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'see': 3.sg. *lyāka*, PPt *lyelyku/ lyelykoṣ/ lyelyakor/lelkor*; *lu*ʔ- 'rub': 3.sg. *lyāwa*, PPt in *lyelyuwormeṃ*; but *säl*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'throw': 3.sg. *ṣälla*, PPt *sesalyu* does not really belong here, see s.v. *säl*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'fly'.

Pt II: The only type of PPt formation attested for PPts belonging to preterits of Class II has reduplication and the endings -*u*, -*oṣ*. In all cases, both the consonant of the reduplication syllable and the root-initial consonant (cluster) are either overtly palatalized or can be the regular outcomes of palatalized consonants. All PPts have (*)-*ä*- as the root vowel, hence the reduplication vowel is always -*e*-, e.g., *tuk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'hide': *ceccuku/ ceccukoṣ.*

Pt III: The usual type of PPt formation attested for PPts belonging to preterits of Class III has reduplication and the endings -*u*, -*oṣ*. PPts (probably) standing beside *s*-preterits that do not follow this type form a PPt of Class 1 (i.e., are not reduplicated and have the endings -*u*, -*uweṣ*, see above 14.1.1.1.). The reduplication vowel is -*e*- or -*ā*-, by umlaut, where the root has -*ā*- as root vowel. In contrast to PPts to preterit Class II, these usually do not have palatalization of the root-initial consonant and the reduplication consonant (as for seeming exceptions starting with -*ly*-, see the discussion in chap. Pt III 9.1.6.2.). In sum, there are two major subgroups of PPts belonging to Pt III: while the root vowel in the PPt class belonging to Pt II is always (*)'-*ä*-, PPt to Pt III can show either (*)(')-*ä*- or -*e*-. For the root *näk*- 'destroy, fall into ruin' indeed both ablaut grades are attested: *nenku*, *nenekoṣ/nenkoṣ*.[7] It is conceivable that the æ-grade type is an innovation, see the discussion in chap. Pt III and Peyrot, 2008, 152f.

---

[6] *au* < pre-PT *ēu̯ did, of course, not cause *ā*-umlaut.

[7] It is possible but far from certain that the different ablaut types *neneku* and *nenku* have different meanings. One of the two attestations of the *e*-vowel type seems to have intransitive meaning 'fallen into ruin' (282 a 6; cf. Saito, 2006, 476 'zugrundegegangen'), while *nenekoṣ* in 512 a 2 is without much context. On the other hand, *nenkoṣ* in 238 a 3 means 'lost' (cf. Saito, l.c.), while

Pt IV: Reduplication and endings -*u*, -*oṣ* added to a variant of the *sk*-suffix is the regular type of inflection for PPts formed to a Pt IV. The suffix variant is in almost all forms the same -*ṣṣ*- exclusively met in the finite forms of Pt IV; in contrast, PPt *ārskoṣ* from *ār*[(a)]- Kaus. II 'abandon' still shows the unpalatalized variant of the suffix (see also the discussion in chap. Pt IV 10.2.). As expected, the reduplication vowel is either -*e*- or its umlaut product -*ā*- where the root vowel is -*ā*-.

Pt V: Reduplication and endings -*u*, -*oṣ* added to the stem-final -*ññ*- is the regular type of inflection for PPts formed to a Pt V. Only the reduplication vowel -*e*- is attested.

Pt VI: *kekamu*/ *kekamoṣ* from *käm*- 'come' (cf. TA *laltu*, *lalntu* from [A]*lä-n-t*- 'go out').

Pt VII: Reduplication and endings -*u*, -*oṣ* added to the root is the regular type of inflection for PPts formed to a Pt VII. As expected, the reduplication vowel is either -*e*- or its umlaut product -*ā*- where the root vowel is -*ā*-. In some of the forms, we meet stem-final palatalization (*auṣu*, *śaśāyoṣ*, and most likely also *aukṣu*), exactly as in the *keklyauṣu* type, and also in *kekalypoṣ* from *-*pyäw*-. For the reasons why the -*ā*- is absent in the PPts to the Subclass 7 *ā*-preterits, and hence (as I think) also in the PPts to preterit Class II, see the discussion in chap. Pt I 7.3.7.

Note that a lot of vowel-initial roots, which, of course, cannot show reduplication, nevertheless form PPts in �*u*, *oṣ*, such as *ālu*, *eṅkoṣ*, *eroṣ*, etc., thereby clearly attesting to the former existence of an accentuation rule that is otherwise evidenced by forms such as *prekwa* and *pātär*. This group of non-reduplicated PPts in *u*, *oṣ* from vowel-initial roots with a full vowel as root vowel is joined by *yāmu*, *yāmoṣ*, which is built from a root starting with a non-syllabic (*yām*- 'do'), but nevertheless descriptively lacks a reduplication syllable. As far as the accent is concerned, *yāmu*, *yāmoṣ* can go back to proto-forms that may never have had reduplication, but on the other hand, derivation from a PT *yäyām- with irregularly preserved reduplication vowel PT *ä from pre-PT *e is also to be taken into consideration.

---

the other (clear) attestations of the stem *nenk*- have the (transitive) meaning 'having destroyed'. I cannot find *nenku* under the signature H 149.323 a 2 quoted by Broomhead II, 140.

14.1.1.3. *Non-reduplicated PPts in -au, -oṣ(o)*

Nom.sg. PT *-å̄wä > -au, -au ⌒u, -o ⌒u/-ow,[8] -owo, -awo,[9] -owä[10]
Obl. PT *-å̄wæs'ä > -oṣ, -oṣo, -oṣä

o mobile, respectively *ä*-variants are here more often attested than in class 2. Even in standard Tocharian B, the accent is still on the ending, cf., e.g., *kätkau*, *kätkoṣ* from *kätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cross'. This PPt formation is only found together with *ā*-preterits of Subclass 1 trough 4;[11] for the origin of PT *-å̄- met here, see below 14.2.

14.1.1.4. *Reduplicated PPts in -au, -aṣ*

Nom.sg. PT *⸴āwä > ⸴au
Obl. PT *⸴āwæs'ä > ⸴aṣ

This type is regularly found together with *ā*-preterits of Subclass 5.[12] As far as I can see, there are no variants attested with *o* mobile or preservation of the final *-ä.

14.1.1.5. *Descriptively non-reduplicated PPt in *-āwä, *-āṣ(ä/o)*

Only *tättārmeṃ* from *tätt^ä-* 'put, set, place', which seems to presuppose a PPt *tättāwä*, *tättāṣ(ä/o).

14.1.2.   *Tocharian A*

Just like in Tocharian B, in Tocharian A the formation of a PPt standing beside an *ā*-preterit stem depends on the root vowel, or, to put it another way, on the respective subclass of Pt I.

---

[8] For the chronology *-o ⌒u/-ow* > *-au*, see Stumpf, 1970, 79ff. and most recently Peyrot, 2008, 50ff.

[9] *pärkawo* in the metrical passage 5 b 4 (Š) looks like a compromise writing between regular *-au* and old *-owo*, if it is not merely a mistake.

[10] For instances, *tsäṅkowä* attested in the small MQ-character text THT 1237 b 2 (metrical, archaic ductus). On the question of *o* mobile and preservation of *-ä*, see Malzahn, 2007a, 282ff.

[11] Occasionally, such a PPt is actually the only indication of the existence of such a Pt I, or of A-character at all, as is the case with *kärkau* 'bound' from *kärk-* 'bind', which seems to otherwise lack A-character and which is, in fact, homonymous with *kärkau* 'robbed' from *kärk^ä-* 'rob'.

[12] Pace Adams, DoT, 716, *spārttau* in 375 a 5 is not a non-reduplicated PPt, but 1.sg. Sub.

In Tocharian A, PPts belonging to *ā*-preterits of Subclass 5 have a reduplication syllable of the structure Cā-, and end in *-u* in the nom.sg. The rest depends completely on the non-syllabic components of the root. As a consequence of the various weakening processes related to the TA phenomenon labeled "vowel balance", pre-TA *C_iā-C_iāC_k-V had to result in TA C_iā$C_i$$C_k$V, and pre-TA *$C_i$ā-$C_i$ā$RC_k$-V in TA C_iāC_iäRC_kV. Strangely enough, pre-TA *C_iā-$C_i$äy/wC_k-V did not result in *C_iā$C_i$äy/wC_kV > TA *C_iāC_ii/uC_kV, which seems to have been the lautgesetzlich outcome of pre-TA *C_iā-$C_i$æy/wC_k-V (to judge from forms such as *kaklyuṣu*), but resulted in TA C_iāC_ie/oC_kV instead; see Peters, 2006, 333, fn. 14 with ref. (but for TB *-oy-* met in optatives and imperfects and TA *wasu-* claimed by Peters, 2006, 338f., fn. 24 to derive from *wæwäs-, see rather chap.s Imp and Opt and below 14.2.1.1., respectively). As for TA *lālupu* from [A]*lup[ä]*- 'besmirch' and the hapax TA *kākrupu* from [A]*krop[(ä)]*- 'gather' attested in A 353 b 3[13] instead of its quite frequent and completely regular variant TA *kākropu*, in these two forms *-up-* maybe reflects a former *-æwpā- that escaped analogical application of *ā*-umlaut.

PPts belonging to a Subclass 3 or Subclass 4 *ā*-preterit, i.e., with a pre-PT root vowel *ä, *i, or *u, lack reduplication, much in the same way as Subclass 1-4 preterits lack reduplication in Tocharian B, and they end in TA *-o*, which is the exact TA equivalent of TB *-ow* > *-au*. Further, they never palatalize root-initial consonants, exactly as their TB equivalents, with the sole exception of the hapax *lyipo* attested in A 104 a 1 instead of and beside regular TA *lipo*; *lyip-* instead of *lip-* shows up also in many other forms, and is probably a blend of the lautgesetzlich zero grade PT *l'äp- with the analogical zero grade PT *läyp-.

As for *ā*-preterits with palatalized root final, Tocharian A shows a reduplicated type in *-u*, and here, again, those with the root vowel TA *ā* show weakening/syncope of the root vowel by vowel balance (TA *pāpṣu* from [A]*pās-*). For the frequently attested PPt TA *kaklyuṣu*, not †*kaklyoṣu* (= TB *keklyauṣu*) from [A]*klyos-* 'listen', see again Peters, 2006, 333, fn. 14. In TA *sasyu* (almost = TB *sosoyu*) from [A]*say-* 'satiate', *-a-* clearly replaced a lautgesetzlich *o*-vowel.

---

[13] Since the akṣaras ⟨kro⟩ and ⟨kru⟩ cannot be confused, I doubt that we can dismiss this form as an "error", i.e., as a misspelling, as suggested by Ringe, 2000, 124, fn. 9; as for TA *lālupu*, the claim made by Ringe, l.c., that its first *u* is due to analogy is completely arbitrary.

As for the other preterit classes, Tocharian A again basically shows the same types as Tocharian B does:

Pt II: The PPt shows reduplication and the ending TA -*u*; the root vowel (almost) always derives from PT *-ä-, which usually palatalizes the root initial (cluster) of the PPt (if possible), and does so even when the respective finite Pt II forms lack palatalization (PPt TA *ñañitku* beside 3.sg.mid. Pt II *nanätkāt* from PPt *^A̲nätk^(a)-* 'hold distant'; TA *ṣaṣpärku* beside 3.pl. Pt II *saspärkänt* from *^Aspärk^(a)-* Kaus. II 'destroy'). To be honest, some forms that exist behave differently from the vast majority, but as argued in chap. Pt II 8.2.4., these forms joined Class II secondarily and have no bearing on the origins of Pt II.

Pt III: The PPt shows reduplication and the ending TA -*u.* As for the root vocalism, because of the phenomenon called "vowel balance" roots with a root vowel PT *ä can only have (*)-*ä*-, and no other vowel, and roots of the structure PT *Cā(R)C(C)- also could only have (had) (*)-*ä*-, cf., e.g., *nānku* < *nānäk- < *nānāk- from *^Anāk-* 'blame'. Quite remarkably, the root vowel (*)-*ä*- almost never palatalizes a root-initial consonant (cluster) in a PPt belonging to a Class III preterit, despite the fact that the finite forms of the active paradigm quite regularly do show root-initial palatalization in Tocharian A. As a matter of fact, only two roots beginning with *l-* show palatalization both in the finite Pt III forms and in the PPt (PPt TA *lyalypu/ lyalyipuräṣ* beside 3.sg. Pt III *lyepäs* from *^Alip^(a)-* Antigv. 'leave'; PPt TA *lyalyku/ lyalyuku* beside 3.sg. Pt III *lyokäs* from *^Aluk-* Antigv. o. Kaus. II 'illuminate'; PPt TA *lyalyutu* from *^Alut-* 'remove' may also belong here, but no finite preterit form is attested). TA *sāsruku* found in A 160 a 3 hardly belongs here; the form may be a mere blunder, but is strongly reminiscent of TA *kākrupu* and TA *lālupu*, and therefore maybe attests to the former existence of a fully lautgesetzlich Pt I paradigm PT 3.sg. *srāwkā/ 3.pl. *sræwkāræ. Saito, 2006, 565 suggests that TA *wasu* from *^Awäs-* 'don' never had reduplication, and that TA *walu* from *^Awäl-* 'die' was coined on the model of TA *wasu*. But the pre-PT *u̯ē/os-u̯ōs reconstructed by Saito does not make any sense diachronically, and *u̯es-u̯os- or *us-u̯os- would, of course, have resulted in †*wsu*. As a matter of fact, TA *wa-* of these forms can go back either to PT *w'æw'ä- or PT *wæwæ-.

Pt IV: The ending TA -*u* is added to the preterit suffix -*ṣ-*. If possible, the PPt is reduplicated, like in Tocharian B, and in that case all roots again show only (*)-*ä*- as root vowel as expected.

Pt V: The ending TA -*u* is added to the preterit suffix -*ññ-*; if possible, the forms are reduplicated, and then show (*)-*ä*- as root

vowel. TA *wewñu* certainly is an analogical substitute for the expected †*weñu*, as per Winter, 1965a, 206 = 1984, 172 = 2005, 131, fn. 1.

The inflection type with TA *-o* is met in the non-reduplicated forms made from *ā*-preterits, but also found in reduplicated PPts made from root allomorphs in *-ā(w)-*: ᴬ*ko-* 'kill': TA *kāko*, ᴬ*klāwᴬ-* 'fall': Pt 3.sg. TA *klā* and PPt TA *kāklo*, ᴬ*ksā-* '± illuminate': TA *kākso*, ᴬ*plā-* '?' only has PPt TA *pāplo*, ᴬ*yᴬ-* 'go': Pt 3.sg. TA *yā* and PPt *yāyo*, ᴬ*wā-* 'lead': Pt 3.sg.mid. *wāt* and PPt *wāwo*, and ᴬ*śāw-* 'live': PPt *śāśo*. From ᴬ*tā(-s)-* we find PPt TA *to*, which descriptively lacks reduplication.

The PPt beside the irregular, (partly) thematic preterit of ᴬ*lä-n-t-* 'go out' shows a reduplicated formation TA *laltu* < *lalätu*, beside which there also exist TA *lalntu* and *lantu* with analogically introduced nasal.

Pt 0: PPts standing beside a root preterit have reduplication, the ending *-u*, and, of course, a non-palatalizing root vowel *ä.

Just like in Tocharian B, the PPt of *yām-* 'do' is irregular (unreduplicated) TA *yāmu* = TB *yāmu* < PT *yāmäwä. The PPt TA *yomu* of ᴬ*yom⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'achieve', which also stands beside a Pt III, is most likely an analogical formation created on the model of TA *yāmu* (and not the lautgesetzlich result of a PIE "*h_1eh_1m-u-", as claimed by Saito, 2006, 564).

One notable difference between Tocharian A and Tocharian B with respect to endings is met in the PPts belonging to Subclass 5 *ā*-preterits. In contrast to Tocharian B, Tocharian A shows no trace of a stem-final PT *-ā- standing in front of *-wä. Winter, 1994, 402f. = 2005, 451f.; 1994a, 298 = 2005, 479 does not want this absence to be due to weakening by vowel balance, but rather compares the TB reduction of expected *CoCoCoC and *CeCeCeC to turn out as *CoCoCC* and *CeCeCC*, respectively. However, Winter himself acknowledged that precisely *CāCāCāC did not undergo reduction in Tocharian B, but survived, and surfaced as CaCāCaC.

Finally, mention should be made of the fact that three TA PPts show *-äC- rather than expected *-äy/wC-, viz. the lexicalized PPt TA *lyalypu* 'karma' (as opposed to Abs *lyalyipuräṣ* 'having left' with expected *-ip-*) from the root ᴬ*lip⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'remain', TA *lyalyku* attested beside TA *lyalyuku* from ᴬ*luk-* 'light up', and finally TA *papyätku* from ᴬ*pyutk-* 'come into being'. Whereas *-lyp-* of TA *lyalypu* can be neatly explained as the completely lautgesetzlich result of the zero-grade allomorph of the respective root, i.e., of pre-PT *-lip- > PT *-l'äp- (as per Kim, 2006, 133), the same cannot be said at all about *-lyk-* and

-pyätk-, because pre-PT *-luk- should have resulted in *-*lk*-, and *pyutk-* in all probability goes back to a pre-PT *pū-T-sk- from PIE *bʰuH-, and accordingly did not show any kind of ablaut in pre-PT at all. So one may guess either that pre-TA forms *l'æl'äkäwä and *pæpyätkäwä were coined on the model of *l'æl'äpäwä at a time when this form still functioned as a PPt and was not lexicalized, or that *l'æl'äwkäwä and *pæpyäwtkäwä in pre-TA were capable of losing the *-w- of their roots by dissimilation.

14.2. DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

In principle, the Tocharian PPt continues the (active) PIE perfect participle with the suffix *-u̯e/os-, as was at first pointed out by Pedersen, 1941, 111. When the underlying verbal stem ended in a pre-PT non-syllabic, the PPt suffix was attached directly to this stem and then the usual insertion of a prop vowel pre-PT *ä between a stem-final non-syllabic and a desinence-initial non-syllabic occurred, so that the pre-PT nom.sg. ending came to be *-äu̯ōs in these cases.

For the phonological development of that *-äu̯ōs, *-äu̯os-, I basically follow Þórhallsdóttir, 1988, 190.[14] In forms lacking reduplication already in Proto-Tocharian the accent fell on the suffix-initial *-ä- and hence caused a development different from the one found with the unaccented suffix in the otherwise quite similar, but reduplicated type, cf. Winter, 1994a, 299f. = 2005, 480f.:

Nom.sg. PT *-áwä > TB -*ú*
Obl. PT *-áwæs'ä > TB -*úweṣ*

In reduplicated PPt formations from roots without A-character, on the other hand, the suffix underwent a different development because the accent lay on the root syllable and not on the suffix-initial *-ä-:

Nom.sg. PT *-́äwä > TB -*u*
Obl. PT *-́äwæs'ä > > TB -*oṣ(o)*

For the root ablaut found in all these formations, see the discussion in chap. Pt III.

As for PPts made from roots with A-character, i.e., PPts belonging to Class I preterits, it is very remarkable that we actually find two

---

[14] See also Winter, 1988a, 211ff. = 2005, 346ff. for a sound law by which *-u̯æ- was lost in Tocharian B after all vowels except *ä, and with the exception of disyllabic forms, hence *śāweṃ*, but *śamāne* < *śāwæmānæ.

different endings in Tocharian B: *-au/ -aṣ* in the reduplicated PPts belonging to Class I preterits of Subclass 5, and *-o͡ṷ/-ow(ä/o) > -au* (*-au͡ ṷ, -awo)/-oṣ(ä/o)*[15] in the unreduplicated PPts that are found beside Class I preterits of Subclasses 1 through 4.

Now as for these differences in inflection, Adams, 1981, 23 assumed that the *ow*-type, and actually all kinds of surfacing *-o-* in the PPts, reflected nom.sg. forms of respective aorist participles in PIE *-ōnt*. Hilmarsson, 1986, 158f.; 1988a, 512 calls the *kälpau/ kälpoṣ* type a "thematic type" to be derived from PIE *-o-ṵōs*, but neither of these two approaches works phonologically or morphologically, see already Þórhallsdóttir, 1988, 187f.

As correctly seen by the same author (1988, 190), one has to set up PT *-āwä* for the reduplicated *papaikau* type, and PT *-åwä* for the unreduplicated *kälpau* type. Now one may ask, of course, whether Early PT *-āwä* could have simply turned into Late PT *-åwä* by sound law, where the *-ā-* of the Early PT sequence *-āwä* bore the accent, as was done first, and not too explicitly, by Cowgill, 1985a, 2f. = 2006, 509. Far more explicitly, but nevertheless without further discussion, Saito, 2006, 574f. made the following claim: "Man könnte also eine Regel aufstellen, wonach das zugrundeliegende Phonem /-ā-/ in einer betonten Silbe als B *-o-*, nach einer betonten Silbe als B *-a-* realisiert worden ist."

Saito, however, simply does not take into account the argument put forth by Þórhallsdóttir, 1988, 206, fn. 7 that in *tallā͡ṷ, tallānt* a(n Early) PT *á* standing in front of a PT *w* did *not* change to a (Late PT *å* >) TB *o*. Unfortunately, the original final syllable of the nom.sg. *tallā͡ṷ* and also the original final syllable of the nom.sg. *tättā͡ṷ* of the PPt made from *tätt͡ᵃ-* 'put' must have been slightly different from the PT *-wä* that one has to set up as the PT final syllable for all nom.sg. forms belonging to PPts (with the exception of *tättā͡ṷ*, of course, the proto-form of which must have undergone analogical influence from

---

[15] Ending variants with *o* mobile or preserved *-ä* are almost exclusively found with the (descriptively) unreduplicated PPts in *-o͡ṷ > -au/ -oṣ*, and with the (equally descriptively unreduplicated) PPt from *yām-* 'do' (*yāmoṣä*); the reduplicated type in *-au/ -aṣ* lacks such variants completely, and for the reduplicated type in *-u/ -oṣ* only two attestations of *-oṣo* can be quoted: *sesīnoṣo* in 9 b 2, and *yainmoṣo* in the metrical passage PK AS 17A b 3 (unpublished). Clearly the preservation of word-final (*)-*ä* as *-ä* or as *o* mobile in the PPts had to do with word length (and/or accent, as per Adams, 1981, 19, fn. 2: preservation in "/kälpówä/", complete loss in "/pāpáykāwä/").

the nom.sg. of a stem/stems ending in *-nt-); see Malzahn, 2006, 389, fn. 2. Note, however, that *karyor* 'buying, business negotiation' clearly points to the former existence of a more archaic PPt **karyau*, **karyoṣ* with accent on the initial syllable;[16] accordingly, the only distribution rule for PT *-āwä and PT *-åwä we can reasonably reconstruct is the *morphonological* rule "use *-åwä/æs'ä whenever the root vowel is *ä, and use *-āwä/æs'ä in any other case", and clearly *not* the phonological rule "turn PT *-áwä into *-åwä" assumed by both Cowgill and Saito.[17] In addition, *tättārmeṃ* clearly points to the former existence of a nom.sg. **tättāwä*, and it would be extremely far-fetched to claim that pre-TB **tättowä* was turned into **tättāwä* secondarily, viz. under the influence of *tättā͡u*. There is then just one meaningful explanation left, the one essentially already advanced by Þórhallsdóttir, 1988, 202, 206, fn. 7 (following a suggestion of Jay Jasanoff), viz. that the *kälpau* type reflects pre-PT *-āu̯ōs, and the *papaikau* type pre-PT *-a/ōu̯ōs. This strategy is also strongly recommended by various kinds of morphological evidence:

(1) The *ā*-preterits of Subclass 5, i.e., the ones connected with the *papaikau* PPt type, are morphologically completely different from the *ā*-preterits of Subclasses 1 through 4, to which PPts of the *kälpau* type regularly belong; it is therefore extremely plausible to assume that the respective PPts were morphologically even more different.

(2) It would not make any sense to derive the primary formations among the *ā*-preterits of Subclasses 2 and 3 from zero grades of verbal roots with attached pre-PT *ō or pre-PT *a (< PIE *H?), but excellent sense to derive all of those from PIE aorist formations ending precisely in pre-PT *-ā- (< PIE *-eh$_2$[(e)h$_1$]).

---

[16] As far as I can see, the word-initial accent of **karyau* can only be explained as a reflex of preserved pre-PT reduplication; one may assume that in the course of the prehistory of TB **karyau*, a pre-PT *kʰi-kʰri̯a-u̯ōs turned immediately into *ku-kʰri° by sound law, and that the reduplication syllable of this PPt form, precisely because it turned into *ku-, later escaped both the haplological loss of all the other reduplication syllables of the pre-PT *Cä/i/u-type, and also the sound change Early PT *C(C)ä- > *C(C)æ- that (as per Peters, 2004, 440ff.) occurred in the PPts and *ā*-preterits. (For a recent different account of *karyor*, see Pinault, 2008, 435, 446 and Pinault, 2009, 482.)

[17] To be sure, it would not be impossible, but completely arbitrary and circular to assume that the morphonological rule reconstructed by me above had developed out of a phonological rule as reconstructed by Cowgill and Saito, especially if one also takes into account the absolutely negative evidence furnished by *tallā͡u* and *tättā͡u*.

(3) -*o*- is also met in the optative and imperfect morpheme -*oy*- that regularly shows up where the basic verbal stem ended in PT *-ā-, and cannot be derived from a PT sequence *-āy- in a meaningful way.

(4) There is evidence for at least two (former) abstracts in TB -*ol* from PT *-ål < pre-PT *-āl attested beside respective historical stems in (*)-*ā*-, viz. *trokol* '± provisions' (obviously from PT *träwkål) and *yotkolau* '± foreman/director' (obviously presupposing PT *w'ætkål), as per Pinault, 2009, 481f. To these two I think one should add the adverb *aiwol* 'towards'; although a Prs IV *aiwotär* built from the respective root does exist, otherwise abstracts in -*l* are never based on a present stem when there were verbal stems other than the respective present stem available in Tocharian (see s.v. *truk*^ä- '± give, portion'), and from *aiw*^(a)- 'be turned toward, incline to' a Pt I 3.sg.act. *aiwā-ne*, PPt *aiwau* also exists. Since there is only evidence for a (pre-)PT abstract suffix *-l and not any for a variant pre-PT *-u̯ol > PT *-wæl (as assumed in Pinault, 2008, 384), it would be completely arbitrary to derive these three formations from proto-forms in PT *-åwæl rather than from proto-forms in PT *-ål < pre-PT *-āl, and then make the additional claim that PT *-åwæ- once more resulted from an earlier PT sequence *-áwæ-. The obvious solution for these three (former) abstracts in TB -*ol* then is that they are simple archaisms, that is lexicalized formations dating from an earlier stage when the respective stems that ended (almost) always in (*)-*ā*- in historical times still had an allomorph in (pre-PT *-ā- >) PT *-å- that was automatically chosen when a suffix was to be attached that started with a non-syllabic.[18]

Accordingly, it is quite obvious that Jay Jasanoff was right, and that in the PPts of the *kälpau* type a pre-PT vowel *ā was preserved as PT *å that was generally replaced by PT *ā in the respective finite forms. A similar conservative behavior is found with the PPt *lyelyku* from *läk*^(a)- 'see' and all the PPts synchronically belonging to a Pt II and lacking stem-final PT *ā as well as *lyelyku*; as argued in chap. Pt I, the absence of stem-final PT *ā met in these PPt forms is more archaic than its presence in the finite forms, which was due to a blend of Narten preterits and aorists ending in a pre-PT *-ā-morpheme.

As for the stem-final -*ṣ* met in the obl.sg. forms, quite obviously a palatalizing vowel must have followed the suffix allomorph pre-PT *-u̯os- in prehistorical times, and I cannot see any better option than to

---

[18] For a further argument, see in the verbal index s.v. *kur*^{ä?}- 'age'.

derive these obl.sg. forms from loc.sg. forms in pre-PT *-u̯os-i (as per Peters, 2006, 344, fn. 48), or maybe *-u̯os-en.

As for the *-nt-* inflection of Tocharian A (nom.sg. TA *yāmu*, but obl.sg. TA *yāmunt*), one may be reminded of the *-nt-* inflection of the active perfect participles in Aeolic Greek, which no doubt was caused by an analogical influence from the present and aorist participles in -ντ-. Adams, 1981, 23 and 1988a, 133f. seems indeed to assume influence from aorist participles in *-ōnt also in order to account for that TA *-nt-* inflection. As a matter of fact, the really existing *nt-*participles of historical Tocharian A inflect completely differently from the TA PPts, and therefore it may be better to follow received opinion which says that *-u, -unt* and *-o, -ont* in the TA PPts is due to analogical influence from the pre-PT *-u̯ont-[19] adjectives, see, e.g., Þórhallsdóttir, 1988, 185 and Pinault, 1990b, 84.[20]

14.2.1.   *Reduplication*

It is regularly just the first consonant of an initial consonant cluster that shows up in the reduplication syllable. There are two exceptions, however, the initial cluster *st-* (and its palatalized variant), which can get fully reduplicated, and the cluster *sp-*; as for the latter, we find both PT *s(')æ-sp(')- and PT *p(')æ-sp(')-, which points to original full reduplication pre-PT *spV-sp-.[21] Roots starting with a vowel do not show reduplication. As argued in greater detail in chap. Sub I/V 18.7.1., the TB evidence clearly points to the conclusion that within basically reduplicating verbal categories, in front of root allomorphs with pre-PT *ä, *i, *u as syllable peaks reduplication syllables must have been absent already exceedingly early, whereas in front of root allomorphs with pre-PT vowels other than *ä, *i, *u implementing the syllable peaks, reduplication syllables of the structure pre-PT *Ce- > PT *C(')ä- did exist for quite a long time, and left traces of various kinds even in historical Tocharian B. As far as the PPts alone are concerned, this distribution has been basically recognized and

---

[19] Thus first Þórhallsdóttir, 1988, 197.

[20] According to Pinault, l.c., the pre-PT *-u̯ont- adjectives also had a nom.sg. ending "*-wōs, plutôt que *-wōnt", just like the PPts, but this suggestion is not confirmed by the TB evidence; see Malzahn, 2006, 389, fn. 2.

[21] This evidence is in full accordance with the behavior of initial clusters in Indo-Aryan, Latin, Germanic (see Kuryłowicz, 1966 = 1975, 388-394), and probably Hittite as well (see Forssman, 1994, 103).

explained already by Krause, WTG, 156, § 157,4. As for the explanation one must, of course, assume that pre-PT *C$_i$e-C$_i$ä/i/u- first turned regularly into *C$_i$ä/i/u-C$_i$ä/i/u-, and that next, that new kind of reduplication syllable was subsequently lost. As for the fact that almost all former PPts[22] with a surfacing reduplication syllable have a reduplication vowel that is to be traced back to a PT *(')æ, and not to a diachronically expected PT *(')ä from PIE *e, there are basically three reasonable strategies available in order to account for the PT *(')æ: First, one could try to derive it from a pre-PT *ē, as has been done by Lindeman, 1969, 15ff. = 1996, 68ff., who invoked forms from other branches said to reflect such a reduplication vowel *ē such as Greek "δηδέχαται"[23] and Vedic *jāgára* (see for such forms especially Krisch, 1996, passim, and most recently Kim, 2003, 201, with ref.). Second, one could assume that pre-PT *o was substituted for the expected reduplication vowel pre-PT *e, where the vowel of the root was pre-PT *o, and that the new *o was then generalized as a reduplication vowel, as has been done by Harðarson, 1997, 95ff., and independently by Saito, 2006, 576. Third, one could try to establish a sound law pre-PT *e > *ē/o or rather PT *(')ä > *(')æ applying only in certain special phonological contexts, as has been done most recently by Peters, 2004, 440ff. (somewhat similarly already Schmidt, 1985a, 764f.).

To judge again from the evidence furnished by Tocharian B, in the PT period the substitution of the preserved reduplication vowel pre-PT *e by PT *æ must have been confined to PPt forms, and clearly did not occur in finite verb forms, even not in those to be derived from active perfect forms. As far as I can see, this restriction can only be explained within the framework of Peters' approach, according to which a "Lautwandel *-ä- > *-æ-" occurred "in maximaler Akzent-ferne" only. Against Harðarson's theory one also has to object that pre-PT *sesūs 'son' did not turn into *sūsūs, nor pre-PT *dʰe-dʰa-u̯ōs into *dʰadʰau̯ōs. As for the preservation of the reduplication vowel *-ä- in *tättā͡u*, TA *to* < pre-TA *tätāwä (and possibly also in a PT *yäyāmäwä), here we are dealing with one (or two) of the most frequently used (and semantically most bleached) verbs of Tocharian, so that it is reasonable to reckon with irregular (i.e., informal) phonological developments in precisely these forms.

---

[22] There are actually two exceptions, pre-PT *sesūs (< PIE *se-suH-us) 'son', cf. the attested plural TB *s$_ä$suwa*, and *tättā͡u*.

[23] Note that such a form does not exist except in the manuals; see Forssman, 1978, 3ff.

14.2.1.1. *Reduplication of roots starting with wV-*

In many cases we simply have to do with the regular outcomes of analogically preserved, or rather restored, sequences of the structure PT *w(')æ-w(')V-, such as TA *wawu* from ^{A}*wä(s)$^?$-* 'give', TA *wāwlu* from ^{A}*wäl^a-* 'cover', and TA *wāwäsku* from ^{A}*wāsk$^{(a)}$-* 'move', which hardly need any further comment.[24] There also exist a lot of forms, however, which seem to show a (more) lautgesetzlich treatment of what once must have been a sequence of reduplication syllable and root syllable. These forms simply have (1) TA *waC-* which is attested quite often; (2) TA *wāC-* attested only once, in TA *wāmpu* from ^{A}*wāmp$^{a?}$-* 'decorate', which certainly shows a more lautgesetzlich development than TA *wāwlu* from ^{A}*wäl^a-* 'cover', and TA *wāwäsku* from ^{A}*wāsk$^{(a)}$-* 'move', as per Winter, 1965a, 206 = 1984, 172 = 2005, 131, fn. 1; (3) TA *woC-* attested also quite often, and TB *au-* found only in TB *aultsu* from *wälts$^?$-* 'sum up, condense', *auṣu* from *wäs-* 'dwell, abide, live, lie down', and *ausu* from *wäs-* 'don, wear (clothes)' (for which see Ringe, 1989a, passim), undoubtedly a reshaped outcome of more archaic pre-TB *woC-* (as per Ringe, 1989a, 38). As already stated in chap. Sound Laws 1.6., TA *waC-* is the expected lautgesetzlich result of both PT *w'æw'äC-[25] and PT *wæwæC-,[26] and both TA *woC-* and pre-TB *woC-* are the expected lautgesetzlich outcome of PT *wæwuC- < *wæwäC-,[27] but as already stated above, one can never

---

[24] The same holds for roots starting with *yV-*. Whenever analogy did not interfere, intervocalic pre-PT *-i̯- was lost exceedingly early, see chap. Sound Laws 1.2.

[25] To be expected in PPts belonging to Pts II, and maybe possible also in PPts belonging to Pts III. Our expectations with regard to PPts to Pts II are indeed fully confirmed by the evidence from the root ^{A}*wät$^{(a)}$-* Kaus. III 'erect', which shows *wa-* in the PPt TA *watunt* (contrasting with the *wo-* from preserved or rather restituted *w(')æ-w(')ät-* found in the 3.pl. *wotār*), and the root ^{A}*wätk$^{(a)}$-* Kaus. II 'command'; here we find *waC-* in the lexicalized TA *watku* 'command', which should be expected to derive directly from *w'æw'ätk-* (as correctly seen by Kim, 2003, 215f.), whereas the synchronic PPt TA *wotku* owes its *wotk-* no doubt just to finite *wotk-*, which according to me was the lautgesetzlich result of PT *w'äw'ætk-*. For the preservation of a more archaic structure *C$_i$'æ-C$_i$'äC- in a PPt to a Pt II, cf. TA *ñañitku* beside TA *nanätkāt*, and TA *ṣaṣpärku* beside TA *saspärkānt*.

[26] To be expected in PPts belonging to Pts III.

[27] To be expected in PPts belonging to Pts III and VI. Hence I do not follow the claims made by Winter, 1977, 157 = 1984, 202 = 2005, 194 (TA *waC-* rather the result of "a dissimilation"), Winter, 1980b, 545f. = 2005, 232f., and

completely exclude that TA *woC-*, pre-TB *woC- was the laut-gesetzlich outcome of a morphologically even more archaic sequence PT *w(')äw(')æC- with the original reduplication vowel *-ä-* < pre-PT *-e- still preserved.

14.2.2. *Gemination of root-initial consonants*

Sometimes in PPts the root-initial consonant gets geminated in the position after the reduplication vowel, and such gemination is found especially often in TB PPts belonging to preterits of Class II (such as *śeśśamu*).[28] According to Winter, 1994a, 302f. = 2005, 483f. in the case of the Class II PPts we are dealing with "doppelt reduplizierten Partizipien", although he himself admitted that such formations "bleiben natürlich merkwürdige Bildungen".[29] As a matter of fact, proto-forms such as pre-TB *cæ-cä-cäl-äwä (actually first assumed in 1924 by Wilhelm Schulze, see Schulze, 1924, 173 = Schulze, 1934, 247) would rather make quite excellent morphological sense for everyone who (like me) is prepared to think that in the Pt II of both Tocharian B and A we have to do with forms of the PT *cālā type which were secondarily made into reduplicated forms of the PT *cäcālā type. Since in Tocharian A *cäcālā, etc. were soon to be transformed into forms of the *cæcālā type, it would not come as a huge surprise if only in Tocharian B[30] the additional reduplication syllables such as *cä- would have spread into the PPts, thereby turning pre-TB *cæcäläwä, etc. into *cæcäcäläwä, etc., and the latter proto-form could indeed have resulted in TB *cecclu* by application of the *pātär* accentuation

---

Hackstein, 2001, 31. Ringe, 1989a, 40 is rather inconclusive, and the only thing I can agree about with Kim, 2003, 215f. is his claim that TA *watku* 'command', "as a fossilized verbal noun, probably reflects the original sound-change outcome of" what I would reconstruct as PT *w'æ-w'ätk-äwä.

[28] *-śś-* in *śeśśamu* goes back to more archaic *-śc-*, the original regular result of palatalized (*)-st- which is still preserved in the obl.sg. form *śceścamoṣ*, but this kind of gemination is not confined at all to the outcomes of former consonant clusters.

[29] Cf. Kim, 2003, 214ff., who after a lengthy discussion rather opts for not adopting Winter's solution, pointing out that "as far as I am aware, other IE languages offer no morphological parallels for multiple reduplication"; see, however, the evidence put forth by Knobl, 2004, 274ff. in favor of a real existence of the "monster" of "Re-reduplication".

[30] TA *caccrīku* clearly belongs with the even morpheme-internal geminations of the TA *kuppre* type, for which see chap. Sound Laws 1.8.3.

rule. However, there are at least two problems with such an explanation. First, in PPts belonging to Class II preterits such gemination is not found consistently, but only with *c*, *ś*, *ṣ*, and *ts*; and second, gemination of a root initial is also met in other kinds of reduplicated PPts, most notably and most frequently gemination of *k*, see chap. Sound Laws 1.8.1.1. Accordingly, the gemination found in the *cecclu* kind of PPts is better explained otherwise, and actually one can point out that the Pt II made from the root *stäm⁽ᵃ⁾*- no doubt must have been a pivotal member of that preterital class (as amply argued in chap. Pt I 7.3.7.), that therefore this very Pt II could and even should have acted as a model for the other members of that class, and that precisely in the PPt to the Pt II from *stäm⁽ᵃ⁾*-, geminated root-initial -*ś*- can, and indeed should be taken as the lautgesetzlich result of the former cluster (*)-*śc*-. As for the frequent gemination of root-initial *k* in the likes of *kakkāccu*, one may speculate that in this very PPt, the stem-final gemination was anticipated (note especially the form *kakkācoṣ*, which seems to show metathesis of gemination), and that -*kk*- then may have spread from here. However, gemination of a root-initial obstruent after a reduplication syllable seems also to be met outside of the PPts, viz. in the TB outcome of the (no doubt both extremely frequent and semantically bleached) PIE reduplicated present *d^he/i-d^h(o/e)h_1-, which is the TB root *tättᵃ*- 'put, set, place'. If I understand Hackstein, 1995, 63 correctly, this author doubts that *tättᵃ*- should be explained that way, and rather suggests that expected pre-TB *tätā- underwent two irregular phonological developments: first an irregularly early syncope, which would have triggered *ttā-, and then an irregular preservation of the resulting root-initial geminate *tt-, which, of course, could have happened at least in the position after words ending in a vowel; finally, *ttā- would have been prefixed by a reduplication syllable of the structure *Cä-, that is, by *tä-, obviously under the influence of other present forms with yet preserved reduplication syllables of the shape *Cä-. Granted that extremely frequent and semantically bleached verbal forms like those made from the root PIE *√d^heh_1 could undergo irregular sound change (no doubt because of informal-style variants being borrowed into the more formal styles), it would be still more economical to assume that just one irregular phonological development had occurred, viz. gemination of a root-initial consonant after a reduplication syllable, which would be recommended by other kinds of gemination processes to be found in rather similar contexts, and which would have been another informal-style treatment occasionally

borrowed into the more formal styles. If this reasoning is correct, however, even the instances of root-initial gemination after the reduplication syllable met in the TB PPts may be best taken just for another phenomenon reflecting influence of the informal styles on the more formal ones.

The reduplication syllable never started with a palatalized non-syllabic where the following root syllable did not start with a palatalized non-syllabic; see Ringe, 1991, 76, fn. 47, and Kim, 2003, 201, fn. 20, 207. The alleged exception TA *lalyutäk* to which Kim, 2003, esp. 201f., fn. 21 refers to simply does not exist, cf. chap. Pt II 8.2.2. On the other hand, Ringe and Kim, ll.cc., are most probably wrong in quoting isolated nominal *kokale*, TA *kukäl* 'wheel' as a further example for that morphonological rule, because this word can perfectly well be traced back to a proto-form with a (non-palatalizing) schwa secundum instead of a PIE *e vowel, i.e., have been based on a PIE collective $*k^u_{\partial}k^u l\acute{e}h_2$, as per Eichner, 1985, 139ff. (see esp. 139, fn. 32 with further ref.).

THE IMPERFECT

In general, Tocharian A and B differ with respect to imperfect formation, with one notable exception: the synchronically irregular formation of the imperfect paradigms for ^{AB}i- 'go' and *nes-/* ^{A}*nas-* 'be', which can both be traced back to a common, inherited PT paradigm. Tocharian A generally uses the ending set of the preterit in the imperfect, while Tocharian B uses the ending set of the present/subjunctive system, with the exception of the 3.sg. active forms. Apart from the above mentioned two exceptions ^{AB}i- 'go' and *nes-/* ^{A}*nas-* 'be', the imperfect of Tocharian B is always derived from the respective present stem of the root, while Tocharian A shows three different kinds of imperfect formations. This fact clearly speaks in favor of the assumption that the creation of the category imperfect was a rather recent innovation. The formation of the imperfect is in many respects parallel to that of the optative, and it is precisely the PIE optative that morphologically underlies almost all of the Tocharian imperfect formations.

The Tocharian imperfect is used "wo ein Geschehen als unabgeschlossen zu denken war, bzw. dann, sofern es sich um Zustandsverben handelte, wenn ein Zustand in der Vergangenheit bezeichnet werden sollte" (Thomas, 1957, 307). In contrast, the Tocharian preterit is used much like Ancient Greek aorist formations, which tallies with the fact that morphologically, at least the core of the Tocharian preterit forms is to be derived from PIE aorist stems.

It has become customary to follow Krause's view that the Tocharian imperfect is based on an optative, i.e., optative potentialis; see TEB I, 218, § 393, fn.; in detail treated by Krause, 1950, 29ff.: "When a repeated action of the past tense is tied to a condition, there can hardly be a distinction between potential (optative) and imperfect, and from such uses the optative was extended in the sense of an indicative imperfect". Apart from the cases of British imperfects to be derived from optative forms that were invoked by Krause, 1950, 24ff. as a typological parallel, optatives denoting past tense are also attested in Middle Iranian languages, so that one may even reckon with a direct influence of Iranian languages on Tocharian in this

respect (as per Pinault, 2002a, 244 with ref.). For optatives functioning as preterits, especially habitual preterits, see also Méndez Dosuna, 1999, esp. 337ff. (with further literature), who rightly stresses that "le passage d'un mode au domaine du temps est un fait assez extraordinaire".

15.1.   THE IRREGULAR IMPERFECTS OF ^{AB}i- 'go' AND nes-/^{A}nas- 'be'

From a synchronic point of view, the one type of imperfect paradigm attested for those two stems is irregular, but on the other hand, the relevant paradigms of Tocharian B and A can be derived from one single common Tocharian paradigm. For the function of these imperfect forms, see Batke, 1999, passim, esp. 67f. (summary), who has shown that the TA imperfect paradigm TA ṣem, etc. is used in the same way as the finite present forms of ^{A}nas-, i.e., is functioning as both copula and verbum existentiae (there are no certain attestations for the meaning 'sich befinden', neither for the present of ^{A}nas- nor its imperfect). The same is true for Tocharian B, where the paradigm ṣaim, etc., serves in a parallel way as imperfect to nes- in the function of both copula and verbum existentiae, whereas the imperfect of 'sich befinden' is formed from the root mäskᵃ-, although the present of nes- may also show this meaning. Note that in Tocharian B the 3.sg. and 3.pl. forms of the indicative present paradigm of the copula are supplied by ste and skente.
The following forms and variants are attested:

	TB 'be'	TA 'be'	TB 'go'	TA 'go'
1.sg.	ṣaim/ṣeym	ṣem	yaim	yem
2.sg.	ṣait/ṣaiyt/ṣaitä[1]	ṣet	yait	yet
3.sg.	ṣai/ṣey/ṣe ı̃/ṣeyo/ṣe[2]	ṣeṣ	yai/yey/yeyo	yeṣ
1.pl.	ṣeyem	ṣemäs	yeyem	—
2.pl.	ṣaicer/ṣeycer	—[3]	yaicer/yeycer	—[3]
3.pl.	ṣeyeṃ/ṣeṃ	ṣeñc	yeyeṃ	yeñc

---

[1] According to Schmidt, 2001, 313, fn. 60, in 84 b 1 (contra TochSprR(B), fn. 5) there is no 2.sg. variant ṣaiyi(t) attested, but one rather has to read and restore to ṣaiy<y>i[ṣ](ka) 'Kindchen'.

[2] This informal variant is attested in PK Bois C3; see Pinault, 2007, 195, fn. 23.

[3] I cannot find the 2.pl. forms TA yeycer or TA ṣeycer as listed in TEB I, 217, § 392 in any published text.

As for the variation ⟨ai⟩ ~ ⟨ey⟩ met in these forms, ṣai ~ ṣey is amply discussed in Stumpf, 1990, 107 and most recently by Peyrot, 2008, 58f.: according to Stumpf, the variant ṣey does not show up at all in the older text groups that he labels as IA and IB, the first attestations being found in the literary standard variant labeled by him as IC, where nonetheless the variant ṣai is still far more common (41 to 13 attestations), but then prevails in the group II, i.e., in documents of profane nature and in the eastern variant of Tocharian B (8 to 1). It fits into this picture that three of the four attestations of the 1.sg. variant ṣeym are also found in eastern texts,[4] and that the 1.pl. ṣeyem and the 2.pl. variant ṣeycer are attested in eastern context, whereas the 2.pl. ṣaicer is found in a standard text from Šorčuq. On the other hand, the longer variant of the 3.pl. ṣeyeṃ is found in texts from all regions. Note that, e.g., the manuscript of the KVāc (the provenance of which is actually unknown, although Schmidt, 1986, IV assumes that it must come from either Qizil or Tumšuq) has a paradigm 1.sg. ṣaim, 2.sg. ṣaiyt, 3.sg. ṣey, and 3.pl. ṣeyeṃ. The shorter 3.pl. variant ṣeṃ is attested generally far more often than the longer variant.[5] In general, the same rules hold for the imperfect forms of *i-* 'go'. One of the two attestations of the 3.sg. *yey* comes from an eastern text (the provenance of the text providing the second attestation H 149.311 is unknown); as for *yeyo* attested in an MQ text, *-ey-* here, of course, shows up in front of a vowel.[6] The 3.pl. *yeyeṃ* is attested four times, once in a text from Šorcuq, twice in eastern texts (the fourth is found in H 149.334 of unclear provenance). As for the 1.pl. and 2.pl. forms *yeyem* and *yaicer* ~ *yeycer*, they are only listed in TEB I, 217, § 392 without ref. This distribution of ⟨ai⟩ and ⟨ey⟩ is in accordance with the one met in the cases of the pronominal form *cai* ~ *cey*, for which see

---

[4] The fourth comes from THT 1371 frg. a a 2. This text has no find-spot signature, but the ductus speaks in favor of an eastern provenance and we have the eastern-dialectal variant *kauś* for *kauc* in frg. g b 2, cf. Peyrot, 2008, 223.

[5] See now Peyrot, 2008, 142ff. showing that the shorter 3.pl.act. Opt/Imp ending variant *-oṃ* is older than the longer *-oyeṃ*, and hence the former must be considered the lautgesetzlich outcome, while the latter is analogical.

[6] At first glance, the word-final mobile *-o* seems to be reminiscent of the one met in *śem(o)*, which is, however, best derived from *gʷēm-(e)t (see chap. Pt VI) and therefore cannot furnish a parallel. Nevertheless, a prop vowel *-ä- could have developed in front of the 3.sg. active ending *-t after a stem-final non-syllabic in any case.

also Stumpf, l.c., and the numeral *trai* ~ *trey* (as per Winter, 1999, 257f.).

A 3.sg. variant *ṣe ͚* is attested in the paleographically middle archaic manuscript 273 b 4 (for its classification see Malzahn, 2007a, 264), and another attestation of such a form can now also be found in THT 1859 a 4, which shows what I label common archaic ductus: *se orotse kaśyape ñem ṣe ͚* "The name of this one was the Great Kaśyape (= Skt. Mahākāśyapa)". As correctly guessed by Stumpf, 1990, 107, fn. 137, the instances of *ey* and *e ͚* found in the oldest (= IA) text group no doubt render "eine Vorstufe des *-ai*-Diphthongs", and are to be put on a same level with the instances of *e͞u* and *ew* rendering a predecessor of *au* (see also Winter, 1955, 217ff. = 2005, 2ff., features no. 7-9; WTG, 6f., § 3,1,b). On the other hand, the same middle archaic manuscript that has *ṣe ͚* in 273 b 4 also shows *cai* (274 a 4 and 275 b 4), just like the common archaic manuscript 133 b 6, while another middle archaic manuscript has *cey* (587 b 4).

The evidence then is, as per Stumpf, 1990, 107, fn. 137, that we first have to do with *e ͚/ey* in the archaic texts, that even there *e ͚/ey*-forms already tend to be replaced by the standard *ai*-forms, and that *ey* finally shows up in the most progressive variants of Tocharian B, which looks like a Duke of York development *e ͚/ey > ai > ey*.

Krause (WTG, 6, § 3,1,a) suggested that *ey* in *ṣey* and *yey* may have been analogically introduced from the plural forms in *-eyeṃ*, and a similar solution could be proposed for *cey* in view of the paradigmatically related forms *ceṃ*, etc.,[7] but such an explanation could hardly work for the variant *trey*, because 'three' lacks forms with regular *-eyV-* or *-eC-* in its paradigm. Therefore, we evidently have to do with a sound change /aḭ/ > /eḭ/ that occurred in monosyllables only, and maybe was restricted to *ai*-diphthongs that derived from older /eḭ/.[8] Since this sound change is attested only for

---

[7] Paradigmatic influence from the oblique *ceṃ* etc. has indeed already been invoked before by Winter, 1999, 258, although merely in order to explain why there are some instances of virāma-less writings of *cey*, whereas there are no cases of virāma-less writings of *trey*, which, according to his survey, is always rendered as ⟨trey͞a⟩. Note that WTG, 6, § 3 also toys with the idea that *ey* varying with *ai* may possibly render an "ältere[n] Sprachzustand".

[8] Note that *snai* 'without' never shows a variant †*sney*, and that this preposition is to be derived from a form ending in pre-PT *-aḭ (either a PIE locative *snah₂i, as per Klingenschmitt, most recently 2004, 251= 2005, 542; or from a PIE dative *sṇh₂-éḭ or a "Lok. Sg. eines Kollektivums *sṇh₂-éh₂-i*", as

two very frequent irregular paradigms, a pronominal form and a
cardinal number, it is highly likely that this /ei̯/ was introduced from
the informal styles of Tocharian B (which had simple
monophthongization of /ai̯C/ to /eC/ otherwise, i.e., in polysyllables).
Quite possibly, in this case the informal styles of Tocharian B may
have just retained the original pronunciation, i.e., the *ey*-diphthong
still evidenced by early texts.

   As for the origin of this early TB diphthong /ei̯/ in our imperfect
forms, this can only have been PT *-æy-, the presence of which can be
accounted for by what became the standard etymology for this kind of
imperfect formation. According to common analysis, the forms are
ultimately based on the optative paradigms that belonged to the roots
PIE *√h₁es 'be' and PIE *√h₁ei̯ 'go', i.e., *h₁s-i̯éh₁-/*h₁s-ih₁´-, etc., with
*ṣæy, etc., deriving from pre-PT forms preserving the full-grade suffix
allomorph *-i̯ē-, etc., to which the otherwise generalized optative >
imperfect suffix allomorph *-ī- from *-ih₁- had been added. This
etymology was first proposed by Pedersen, 1941, 206; see also Lane,
1953a, 46ff.; Watkins, 1969, 201f.; Pinault, 1989, 128; 2008, 609f.; Ringe,
1995, 64; Adams, DoT, 345. Alternatively, Klingenschmitt, 1975, 156ff.
= 2005, 140ff., operates with PT stems "*s'äi̯-" and "*i̯äi̯-", i.e., quite
interestingly seems to claim a development PT *äy > TB *ey > ai* for
monosyllables; however, Klingenschmitt is forced to assume that the
imperfect stem to *h₁es-, i.e., his *s'äi̯-, was just modeled on the
imperfect stem to *h₁ei̯-, i.e., his *i̯äi̯(-), which, of course, would derive
from a PIE (augmentless) imperfect stem *h₁ei̯-, and not from an
optative formation. Again differently, Kortlandt, 1996, 171f., and
Winter, 1999, 263f.

15.2. THE REGULAR IMPERFECT OF TOCHARIAN B

Apart from the imperfect paradigms of *i-* 'go' and *nes-* 'be', the
imperfect in Tocharian B is always derived from the present stem of
the root. It takes on the endings of the present/subjunctive system
(with the exception of the 3.sg. active which is endingless on the
surface). The present stems of Classes V and VI, i.e., those ending in a
stem-final *-ā*, show an imperfect suffix *-oy-*, while the imperfect forms
derived from the other present stem classes show an imperfect suffix
-ĭ-, which usually palatalizes a preceding, palatalizable consonant

---

per Hackstein, 1997, 53f.; or from a PIE directive *snai̯, as per Peters, 2002,
119f., fn. 43.).

(cluster), with the noticeable exception of the present Classes III and IV (cf. TEB I, 218, § 394; Hackstein, 2004, 89, fn. 14). There is just one single attestation of an imperfect with palatalized root final made to a Prs III stem, viz. the 2.sg. (sic) *kulyitär-ś*[9] from *kul*[a]- 'recede'. All other imperfects of that class show a non-palatalized stem final.[10] The suffix variant *-oy-*, of course, also does not palatalize. Krause, 1950, 31 states with respect to variation in palatalization: "*-sk, -s, -n, -l*, always become *-ṣṣ, -ṣ, -ñ, -ly*; but only in some verbs does *-k* become *-ś* (and correspondingly *-ṅk* become *-ñc*). Hence, the connecting *i*-vowel is obviously derived from IE *-oi̯-* (thematic) and partly perhaps from IE *-ī-* (athematic)." However, it is difficult to see why the imperfects of present Classes III and IV should go back to thematic stems, while just those belonging to the thematic classes (!) should go back to the athematic suffix variant, because in front of the TB imperfect suffix *-i-*, palatalization of a palatalizable non-syllabic is actually only (NB: quite regularly!) absent in TB imperfects to members of present Classes III and IV.[11] Quite remarkably, in the case of roots forming a Class III or IV present Tocharian A also behaves oddly with respect to imperfect formation; as a matter of fact, in Tocharian A Class III and IV presents simply lack imperfects that look like imperfects, i.e., show the expected regular imperfect morphology. Instead of such forms, it seems that the respective Pt I forms were used whenever an imperfect form was syntactically required (to be honest, I know of just one certain example of such a use, TA *satkar*, for which see below 15.3.1.) or at least original preterit stem formations (in the case of the *s-*

---

[9] Note that the outcome *-ś* for the clitic pronoun of the 2.sg. *-c* is an informal-style feature (see Schmidt, 1986a, 642), so that one may assume that the palatalization of the root final met in this form is also due to a respective phonological or morphological trait of the informal styles.

[10] From Prs III: *mäsk*[a]- 'be' 3.sg. *mäskītär*, etc.; *musk*[(a)]- 'disappear' 3.pl. *muskīntär*; *lu*[a]- 'send' (tr) 3.sg. *lyewītär*, etc.; *spärk*[(a)]- 'disappear' 3.sg. *spärkītär*; *sruk*[a]- 'die' 3.pl. *srukyentär*; *tsäṅk*[a]- '(a)rise' 3.sg. *tseṅkītär*, etc.; *tsälp*[(a)]- 'pass away' 3.pl. *tsälpiyentär* (not †*tsälypiyentär*). From Prs IV *ās*[(a)]- 'dry (out)' 3.pl. *osīyentär*; *plānt*[(a)]- 'rejoice' 1.sg. *plontimar*; *yāt*[(a)]- 'be (cap)able' 3.sg. *yotitär*; *spārtt*[(a)]- 'turn; be' 3.sg. *sporttitär*. It is uncertain whether *perk*[?]- 'peer' (Imp 3.pl. *perśīyeṃtär*, attested in a literary western text) had a present stem of Class II or III; however, since the Imp is palatalized, the stem is rather Prs II than Prs III.

[11] Note that it would be quite absurd, of course, to claim that *-i-* derives phonologically from "*-oi̯-*", i.e., PIE *-oih₁-*, rather than from PIE *-ih₁-* precisely, and only in the imperfects to members of Prs Classes III and IV.

imperfect TA *klawrä*, for which see below 15.3.3.). Note further that in the optatives to Class III subjunctives, the optative morpheme *-i-* always does palatalize the stem final (if possible), with the sole exception of TA *knitär*, and that imperfects to TB presents of the *CoRoC-tär* type, which are descriptively presents of Class I, consistently show palatalization of the stem final, despite their origin as Class IV presents (2.pl.act. Imp *porośicer* from *pārāk*[(a)]- 'prosper' and 3.sg.mid. Imp *wolośitär* from *wālāk*[a]- 'stay'). For an explanation of that aberrant behavior of present Classes III and IV, see chap. Prs III/IV 26.5.3.; for an explanation of *-oy-*, see chap. Opt 23.1.1.

The following imperfect forms (differentiated by present classes) are attested:

PRESENT I: act. 3.sg. *palyśi*, 2.pl. *porośicer*, 3.pl. *porośyeṃ*, *tsopyeṃ-ne*; mid. 3.sg. *klyeñcitär*, *wolośitär*, 1.pl. *pśīyemtär*; PRESENT II: act. 1.sg. *klyauṣim*, 2.sg. *klyauṣit*, 3.sg. *kalñi*, 2.pl. *ṣmīcer*, 3.pl. *klyauṣiyeṃ/klyauṣyeṃ*, *ṣamyeṃ*; mid. 1.sg. *ñaṣṣīmar*, 2.sg. *ñäṣṣitar*, 3.sg. *ñäṣṣītär*, 3.pl. *ñäṣyentär*, *kraupiyentär*; PRESENT III: mid. 1.sg. *mäskīmar*, 2.sg. *krämpitar*, 3.sg. *mäskītär*, 3.pl. *mäskīyentär*, *muskīntär*; PRESENT IV: mid. 1.sg. *plontimar*, 3.sg. *yotitär*, 3.pl. *osīyentär*, *korpyentär*, *wokyentär*; PRESENT V: act. 3.sg. *īyoy*, 3.pl. *śwoyeṃ/śawon/śwoṃ*; mid. (1.sg. *makoymar*),[12] 3.sg. *kwoytär*; PRESENT VI: act. 1.sg. *tarkanoym* (Š), *pälskanoym*, 3.sg. *tärkänoy* (MQ), *pälsknoy*, *tsaknoy*, *waltsanoy-ne*, 3.pl. *kärsanoyeṃ*, *pruknoyeṃ*, *kautanoñ-c*, *pärsnoṃ*, *tsarkanoyeñ-c* (MQ); mid. 3.sg. *kantanoytär*, 3.pl. *kätnoyentär-ne*; PRESENT VII: act. 3.pl. *srañciyeṃ*; mid. 3.sg. *präntsitär*, 3.pl. *kluttañciyentär*; PRESENT VIII: act. 2.sg. *arṣit* (MQ), 3.sg. *prekṣi-ne*, 3.pl. *prekṣiyeṃ*, *likṣyen-ne*; mid. 3.sg. *tsakṣitär*, 3.pl. *tsakṣīyentär-ne*; PRESENT IXa: act. 1.sg. *weṣṣim*, *lkāṣṣim*, 2.sg. *weṣṣit*, *kälpāṣṣit*, 3.sg. *weṣṣi*, *kälpāṣṣi*, *yamaṣṣi*, 3.pl. *weṣyeṃ*, *kälpāṣyeṃ*, *yamaṣyeṃ*, *aiṣṣiyeṃ*; mid. 3.sg. *yamaṣṣitär*, *lkāṣṣītär*, 3.pl. *yamaṣyentär*; PRESENT IXb: act. 1.sg. *talässim*, 2.sg. *tsārwäṣṣit*, 3.sg. *śarsäṣṣi*, 2.pl. *śarsäṣṣicer*, 3.pl. *klutkäṣṣiyeṃ*, *soyäṣyeṃ*, *stamäṣyeṃ/stamṣyeṃ*; mid. 2.sg. *mrauskäṣṣitar*, 3.sg. *krasäṣṣītär*; PRESENT Xa: act. 3.sg. *klāṣṣi*, *lnaṣṣi-ne*, 3.pl. *lännaṣyeṃ*; mid. 3.sg. *päknāṣṣitär*, *sainaṣṣītär*; PRESENT XI: act. 3.sg. *aksaṣṣi*, 3.pl. *aksaṣyeṃ*; PRESENT XII: act. 2.sg. *täṅkwaññet* (sic), 3.sg. *kläntsaññi*, 3.pl. *kläntsaññyeṃ*; mid. (2.sg. *añmaññītar*), 3.sg. *käskaññītär*, 3.pl. *celeñiyentär*, *mäntañyentär*.

Some imperfect forms show a rather unexpected initial accent: 1.sg.mid. *ñaṣṣīmar* (78 a 4, Š; or a misspelling?) from Prs II of *ñäsk-* 'demand', 3.pl. *ṣamyeṃ* (Š, metrical) from Prs II of *ṣäm-* 'sit', *makoymar* (78 a 4, Š, metrical) from Prs V (or Prs VII?) of *mäk*[(a)]- 'run',

---

[12] If this is not an error for Prs VII *ma<ṅ>koymar*. The other forms listed here in brackets may also be analyzed as optatives.

srañciyeṃ (S, prose) from Prs VII of *särk*⁽ᵃ⁾- '± take care of'.[13] On the other hand, *tarkanoym* (78 a 4, Š, metrical) from Prs VI of *tärk*ᵃ- 'emit', *tsarkanoyeñ-c* from Prs VI of *tsārk*ᵃ- 'burn' (rather than *tsärk-* 'burn'), and *tinaṣṣi* (Qu) from Prs IX of *tin*⁽ᵃ⁾- '± defile oneself',[14] despite showing rather unexpected *a*-vowels, hardly belong here.[15]

*śuw*ᵃ- 'eat' has a 3.pl. variant *śawon* beside expected *śwoyeṃ*/*śwoṃ*, just like rhyming *suw*ᵃ-/*swās*ᵃ- 'rain' has 3.pl. *sawoṃ* beside *swoyen*. The æ-grade presupposed by -*a*- from unstressed *-ā- is equally found in the irregular TA imperfect 3.pl. *sawär*, for which see below 15.3.3. On the ending variant -*oN* for -*oyeN* see the similar development in the optative (chap. Opt 23.1.2.).

---

[13] The Imp *tsakṣīyentär-ne* in H 149.323 a 2 does not belong to *tsäk-* 'burn' but to *tsāk-* 'glow'; see Schmidt, 1974, 20, fn. 3.

[14] Prs IXa *treṅkäṣṣi* from *treṅk-* 'cling, stick' attested in the small fragment IOL Toch 1105 a 2 may be an MQ form (IXb inflection is also not excluded).

[15] As for possible diachronic reasons for this unexpected behavior, initial accent is also met in other forms that derive from optatives in pre-PT *-ī-, viz. in the 1.sg.mid. Opt *taccimar* from the Sub V stem *tättā-* 'put, set, place', and, of course, in almost all of the optative forms that belong to Sub I and Sub V stems with (more or less) persistent initial accent. As is argued in chap. Sub I/V, the vast majority among the former present stems underlying Class V subjunctives (and, of course, also Class V presents) that had been built upon respective preterit stems via the *tēzzi* principle had undergone secondary, analogical reduplication. The pre-PT reduplication syllables of the *Ce- type (which did *not* occur before root syllables with pre-PT *ä, *i, *u as root vowel) were finally reflected by initial accent. Accordingly, the initial accent of an Imp *makoymar* (if this indeed belongs to a Prs V stem) would not come as a surprise at all, but should have rather been expected, since such a Class V present made from the root *mäk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'run' would be identical to the Sub V, itself an old present stem built upon a preterit pre-PT *meka- via the *tēzzi* principle. As for the other imperfect forms with initial accent and the one optative form *taccimar* that does not belong to a subjunctive stem created via the *tēzzi* principle, it is feasible to suggest that as soon as an original pre-PT optative stem like *mekāi̯- had started to vary with analogically reduplicated *memekāi̯-, other optatives belonging to presents of a non-*tēzzi* kind of origin such as pre-PT *nesk-ī- may have followed suit, and developed analogically reduplicated variants such as *neneskī-; note that both *taccimar* and all imperfect forms with TB initial accent indeed either surely had, or at least certainly could have had, a pre-PT *e as syllable peak of what were descriptively their initial syllables in historical TB (actually *srañc-* may go back to pre-PT *s(t)rek-nā-).

15.3.   THE REGULAR IMPERFECT OF TOCHARIAN A

TG, 384ff., §§ 490ff. distinguished five different types of imperfect formations for Tocharian A, and TG is basically followed by TEB I, 219ff., §§ 397ff.:

Imp I = Irregular type only attested for ^A*i*- 'go' and ^A*nas*- 'be'
    (see above 15.1.)
Imp II = built on the bare root with the two subclasses:
    Imp IIa = with root vowel pre-PT *ē (*lyāk* type)
    Imp IIb = *s*-imperfect
Imp III = built on the present stem
Imp IV = built on the subjunctive stem

15.3.1.   *The imperfect of Class III*

The most productive imperfect formation of Tocharian A is the one based on present stems of the root (TG, 386, § 464). The ending set is in general the one of the preterits with stem-final (*)-*ā*-, with the exception of the 1.sg.act. ending TA -*āwā* (as opposed to TA -*ā*)[16] and the fact that the imperfect does not undergo the usual weakening by vowel balance (cf. TEB I, 45, § 11, fn. 1; Winter, 1994, 406ff. = 2005, 451ff.). A palatalizable stem-final consonant (cluster) is always palatalized.[17] In what follows I list the roots forming such imperfects sorted according to their present stem class:

PRESENT I: ^A*käln*- 'resound', ^A*ken*- 'call', ^A*pälk*- 'shine, appear', ^A*sälp^ä*- 'glow'; PRESENT II: ^A*käly*- 'stand, be situated', ^A*klyos*- 'hear, listen to', ^A*tā(-s)*- 'put, set, place', ^A*miw^ä*- 'shake', ^A*malyw*- 'crush', ^A*ya(p)*- 'do', ^A*śāw*- 'live', ^A*ṣäm*- 'sit, remain'; PRESENT V: ^A*mänt^ä*- 'destroy'; PRESENT VI: ^A*krop^(ä)*- 'gather', ^A*klis^ä*- 'sleep', ^A*tpuk^(ä)*- '± hide', ^A*räs^ä*- 'stretch', ^A*wāt^ä*- '± thrust', ^A*tsāk^ä*- 'pierce'; PRESENT VII: ^A*kātk^ä*- 'arise', ^A*päl(t)sk*- 'think', ^A*māsk^(ä)*- 'be difficult', ^A*mrosk^(ä)*- 'feel disgust'; PRESENT VIII: ^A*āl^{(ä)?}*- 'keep away', ^A*e*- 'give', ^A*kātk*- Kaus. I 'make glad', ^A*kän*- 'come about', ^A*ku*- 'pour', ^A*ko*- 'destroy', ^A*trisk*- 'sound', ^A*nāk*-

---

[16] Winter, 1994, 408 = 2005, 457 no doubt correctly, supposed analogical creation in order to avoid homonymy with the 3.sg. active forms in TA -*ā*.

[17] Schulze, 1924 = 1934, 241 claimed that palatalization "wirkt […] oft einfach als Funktionszeichen, so regelmäßig bei der Bildung der Imperfekta und oft auch bei der der reduplizierten Präterita", but as far as I can see, the stem-final palatalization met in the TA imperfects of Class III can always be explained as lautgesetzlich. Descriptively, of course, the palatalized consonant (cluster) here always shows up immediately in front of an -*ā*-, which is a vowel that usually does not trigger palatalization.

'blame', *ᴬnäk-* act. 'destroy, lose', *ᴬnu-* 'cry', *ᴬpäk-* act. 'cook, ripen', *ᴬpälk⁽ᵃ⁾?-* 'burn, torment', *ᴬpräṅk?-* Kaus. I 'reject', *ᴬmi-* 'hurt, harm', *ᴬyāṅk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'bewitch', *ᴬyāt⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'enable, tame', *ᴬyu⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. III 'aspire to, reach', *ᴬlä-n-t-* 'go out, emerge', *ᴬläm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'set', *ᴬwik⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II 'drive out', *ᴬwinᵃ-s-* 'honor', *ᴬśāw-* Kaus. III 'live', *ᴬspārtw⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'turn'; PRESENT X: *ᴬkum-* 'come', *ᴬklyos-* 'hear, listen to', *ᴬnäk-* mid. 'fall into ruin, disappear', *ᴬpäk-* mid. 'cook, ripen', *ᴬpäkᵃ-* 'intend', *ᴬwäl-* 'die', *ᴬtsäk-* 'burn'; PRESENT XI: *ᴬoks-* Kaus. I 'make grow'; PRESENT XII: *ᴬkäṣ-ⁱññ-* 'reprimand', *ᴬklop-ⁱññ-* 'express sorrow', *ᴬtuṅk-ⁱññ-* 'love'. Unclear present class: *ᴬkary-* 'laugh'. Unclear with respect to root is: TA *nwiññāt* (from *ᴬnwā-* ± bear' or *ᴬwin-ⁱññ-* 'enjoy').

The following forms are actually attested:

1.sg.act.	*tāṣā(wā), ṣmāwā, koṣāwā, spārtwṣā* (sic), *klyosäṃṣāwā*
2.sg.act.	*śāwāṣt, näkṣāṣt, spārtwṣāṣt*
3.sg.act.	*kälñā, keñā, pälśā, meyā, malywā, ypā, ṣmā, kātäñśā, klisñā, räsñā, wātñā, tsākñā, pältsäñśā, eṣā, kuṣā, koṣā, nuṣā, pälkṣā, präṅkṣā, yāṅkṣā, yuṣā, läntṣā, wikṣā, wināṣā, spārtwṣā, kumṣā, tuṅkiññā, karyā*
1.pl.act.	—
2.pl.act.	*klyoṣās, śāwās*
3.pl.act.	*sälypār, ypār, eṣār, trikṣār, nuṣār, wināṣār, kumṣār*
1.sg.mid.	*mäncāwe, wläṃṣe/wläṃṣāwe*
2.sg.mid.	—
3.sg.mid.	*klyāt, ypāt, kropñāt, māsäṃśāt, ālṣāt, kātkṣāt, nākṣāt, śoṣāt, päknāṣāt, okṣiṣāt, kāṣiññāt, nwiññāt*
1.pl.mid.	—
2.pl.mid.	*lämṣāc*
3.pl.mid.	*klyānt, ypānt, mäncānt, kropñānt, tpukñānt, mrosäṃśānt, käṃṣānt, päkṣānt, miṣānt, yātṣānt, nkäṃṣānt, pkäṃṣānt, tskäṃṣānt, klopiññānt*

Note the 1.sg. TA *spārtwṣā* with *-ā* instead of otherwise regular *-āwā*. There is no clear attestation of a 3.sg. Imp TA (*)*klyoṣā* from the root *ᴬklyos-* 'listen'. The 1.pl. TA *klyoṣāmäs* in A 340 a 6, 3.pl. TA *klyoṣār* in A 81 a 6 and maybe also in A 436 b 3 are more likely preterits. All clear instances of non-present indicative forms of *ᴬpās-*, *ᴬwles-*, and *ᴬsār?-* are also rather preterit forms. The restoration to a 1.pl.mid. Imp TA (*ypā*)*mät* is not likely, see s.v. *ᴬya(p)-* 'do'.

As already pointed out above, no imperfect forms derived from a present stem of Class III or IV are attested in Tocharian A. In contrast, Tocharian B does show imperfects made from such stems, although

almost all of these forms lack the usual palatalization. The lack of
imperfect forms made from such present stems in Tocharian A cannot
just be a coincidence, because there is actually at least one form that
functions syntactically as an imperfect from such a root, and which is
morphologically a preterit, viz. the 3.pl.act. TA *satkar* from ^A^*sätk*^(a)^-
'spread out' in A 312 a 3 (pace Thomas, 1957, 64, fn. 1 and 197 this is
hardly a case of "Tempuswechsel", which would be quite arbitrary to
assume for the relevant passage). See chap. Prs III/IV for possible
reasons why these present classes behaved differently with respect to
imperfect formation.

15.3.1.1. *Imperfect III and the TB preterit type klyauṣa*

It is customary to formally connect this TA imperfect type with the TB
ā-preterit type showing root-final palatalization. At first sight, there
even seems to exist one cognate in the case of *klyaus-/* ^A^*klyos-* 'hear,
listen to', with Prs II 3.sg.mid. TA *klyoṣtär*, Imp 2.pl.act. *klyoṣās*, Pt I
PPt *kaklyuṣu*, TB Pt I 3.sg. *klyauṣa*, etc., PPt *keklyauṣu*. On the other
hand, the root ^AB^*cämp-* 'be able to' shows completely different
formations in Tocharian A and B, viz. a Prs II 3.sg. TA *cämpäṣ*, etc.,
but an *s*-extended Imp TA 3.sg. *cämṣṣā* (sic, for **cämpṣā*)/*cämṣā*/
cimṣā, and a Pt III 3.sg. TA *campäs*, etc., while Tocharian B has a Pt I
with *y*-insertion 3.sg. *campya*, etc. Since ^A^*cämp-* had an *s*-preterit in
Tocharian A, the Imp TA 3.sg. **cämpṣā* was evidently built from an *s*-
present stem standing in the usual way beside an *s*-preterit rather
than directly from the Prs II. Somewhat similarly, *tränk-* 'lament' had
a Pt I with palatalized root final, whereas its TA equivalent ^A^*tränk-*
'say, speak' formed an *s*-imperfect (see below 15.3.3.). For a diachronic
analysis, see chap. Pt I 7.3.9.

15.3.2. *The root imperfect of the type TA lyāk*

The TA imperfects to be discussed in this and the following section
are root formations rather than present stem formations (cf. TEB I,
220f., § 399,1; labeled Class IIa in TG, 385, § 462). The *lyāk*-type
imperfects are characterized by palatalization of the root initial and an
ā-vowel in the root pointing to PT *æ*-grade, viz. pre-PT *ē*-grade.
Unlike the imperfects of Class III, the root imperfects of the type *lyāk*
(and also the *s*-imperfect) are subject to the regular weakening process
triggered by vowel balance. We have the following cases:

Akärs(a)- 'know' Prs VI Imp 3.pl. TA *śarsar*; *Akälp*(a)- 'obtain' Prs VI Imp 3.sg.mid. TA *śalpat*; *Atärkᵃ*- 'dismiss, emit' Prs VI Imp 3.pl. TA *cārkar*, 3.sg.mid. TA *cārkat*; *Apär*- 'bear' Prs II Imp 3.sg.mid. TA *pārat*, 3.pl.mid. TA *pārant*; *Aläk*(a)- 'see' Prs V Imp 2.sg. TA *lyākaṣt*, 3.sg. TA *lyāk*, 3.pl. TA *lyākar*; *Atsäk*(a)- 'pull' Prs VI Imp 3.pl. TA *śakant*.

Note that the preterit stems for both *Apär*- 'bear' and *Aläk*(a)- 'see' are supplied by different roots, whereas *Akärs*(a)- 'know' and *Atärkᵃ*- 'dismiss, emit' form an *ā*-preterit of Subclass 4 (with pre-PT *e as root vowel in the singular active), which is also likely for *Akälp*(a)- 'obtain' and *Atsäk*(a)- 'pull' (where no active singular is attested).

Since TG, 385, § 462, fn. 1 it is customary to equate the TA Imp *lyāk* with the TB *ā*-preterit *lyāka* (of what I call Subclass 7). The other TA imperfect forms of this type do not have such equivalents in Tocharian B. However, the Imp TA *śarsar* is somewhat reminiscent of the TB Class II preterit *śarsa*, as first seen by Pedersen, 1941, 176. Note that *läk*(a)- 'see' does not form a Class II preterit, but one of Class IV.

As for the diachronic origin(s) of both the TB *lyāka*-type preterit and the TA *lyāk*-type imperfect, see chap. Pt I 7.3.7., where the source for the TB preterits of Class II (of the *śarsa* type) is discussed as well.[18]

15.3.3. *The s-imperfect*

Lane, 1948, 307; 1953a, 53ff. noted that the four imperfect forms TA *craṅkäṣt*, TA *craṅkäs*, TA *craṅkär* from *Aträṅk*- 'say', and TA *śepär* from *Atsip*- 'dance' exactly conform to the inflectional pattern of the TA *s*-preterit, e.g., TA *ñakäs*, TA *lyepäs*, and therefore "are identical in formation with preterits of Class III". However, Lane doubted that the palatalization in TA *craṅk*- was original (but see chap. Pt III). These forms clearly attest to a former state of affairs when there was no formal imperfect/preterit distinction.

Yet two forms have to be added here: the 3.pl.act. Imp TA *svawrä/sawr-äṃ* from *Asuw*(a)-/*swās*(a)- 'rain'.[19] Although showing the

---

[18] Note that Rasmussen's explanation of the TA *lyāk*-type imperfect (1992, 111ff. = 1999, 568ff.) seems to differ from the mainstream view. Whereas his claim that these imperfects started out as imperfects (and not as aorists) is also shared by the Jasanoff school, he stands apart with his suggestion that the entire type was created on the model of an (actually unattested) imperfect to the verbum substantivum pre-PT *ēs- to be derived from augmented PIE *e-h_1(e)s-. Regrettably, on this occasion Rasmussen did not comment upon the origin of the preterit type TB *lyāka* and of the Class II preterits at all.

s-imperfect/preterit ending TA *-är*, it is not likely that we are dealing here with a very old *s*-imperfect/preterit formation, because TA *saw-* from PT *sæw-* would only fit the ablaut scheme of a Pt I of Subclass 3. The same root ablaut shows TA *klawrä* attested in YQ 5 a 6. This form is intransitive and correlated with another imperfect form, so that analysis as an *s*-preterit form is syntactically excluded.

15.3.4.   *The imperfect of Class IV*

Some TA imperfects are said to have been built on the subjunctive stem (thus TG, 386f., § 465; TEB I, 220, § 398: "Die wenigen hierher gehörigen Beispiele scheinen keine regelmäßigen Bildungen darzustellen und sind zum Teil schwer zu analysieren"). However, I do not see a compelling reason for analyzing any of these forms as an imperfect built on a subjunctive stem.

Pace Hilmarsson, 1991a, 74, 110, I propose to analyze the *ñ*-formations TA *tpukñānt* and TA *tsākñā* as regular imperfect forms based on nasal present stems of Class VI. TA *tpukñānt* is without context, and since the root from [A]*tpuk*[(a)]*-* '± hide' shows A-character in the grundverb, a nasal present of Class VI would be a perfectly regular present stem formation (Class II made from the respective TB root is surely just an archaism). TA *tsākñā* in A 295 a 3, on the other hand, hardly belongs to [A]*tsāk-* 'glow' at all, but is to be derived from [A]*tsāk*[ä]*-* 'pierce' (see Schmidt, 1974, 20f., fn. 4), for which a Prs VI equivalent is actually attested in Tocharian B. The hapax TA *wātñā* in A 295 a 3 is a regular imperfect to a Prs VI as well, see the discussion s.v. [A]*wāt*[ä]*-* '± thrust, stab'. Finally, the 3.sg. TA *täkwāṣā* in A 449 b 1 and the restored 3.pl. TA *(tä)kwāṣānt* in A 356 b 3 are philologically completely unclear. Though it has to be admitted that the forms would also be somewhat unusual as preterit forms of Class IV (see s.v. [A]*täkw*[ä]*-* '?' and chap. Pt IV 10.1.1.), I am reluctant to accept an imperfect formation based on the subjunctive stem just for these two unclear forms, one of them a restored one.

---

[19] Not from a reduplicated aorist giving TA *svawrä* and TA *sawär* via dissimilation, as per Pedersen, 1941, 178, fn.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE SUBJUNCTIVE

16.1. FUNCTION

"Der tocharische „Konjunktiv" zeigt einerseits unbestreitbar modale Verwendungsweisen, er wird zur Markierung von Erwartungen und Vermutungen verwandt, dient als Voluntativ, und Jussiv, und kommt in verallgemeinernden Relativsätzen und in (konjunktionslosen) Konditionalsätzen zur Anwendung. Neben dem beschriebenen Modalfeld besitzt der tocharische „Konjunktiv" aber noch eine weitere Domäne in seiner Anwendung als Futur" (Hackstein, 2004, 88); see now also Kim, 2007, 185f., and, for a use of the Tocharian subjunctive stem in hypothetical clauses which completely conforms to the use of the PIE subjunctive, Pinault, 1997b, 476ff. As for its function denoting future tense, note the following conclusions in a careful study by Eva Tichy on the use of the subjunctive in Vedic prose: "Nach Aussage des vedischen und griechischen Belegmaterials hat der Konjunktiv in beiden Sprachen expektative Funktion (... 'ich erwarte o. es ist aus meiner Sicht zu erwarten, daß ich/du/er ...') ... Der übereinstimmende Befund beider Einzelsprachen zeugt für einen grundsprachlichen Zustand, auf den sich wohl auch die Verwendung des tocharischen und albanischen Konjunktivs ... ohne Schwierigkeiten zurückführen [läßt]" (Tichy, 2006, 328f.). In addition, Walter in a 1923 booklet on the use of the subjunctive in Homeric Greek even claimed that "der grundsprachliche Gebrauch des Konjunktivs durchaus futurisch war" (Walter, 1923, 94). On the other hand, "le subjonctif est devenu souvent un véritable futur temporel" (Magnien, 1912, 288, with several examples from various branches), or, to put it in the words of Jasanoff, 1984, 79: "Proto-Indo-European made extensive use of the subjunctive to express futurity. This remains one of the commonest functions of the subjunctive in oldest Indo-Iranian; it is the only function to survive in Italic." Accordingly, I see no immediate need to offer special explanations for the temporal use of the subjunctive by deriving the various subjunctive stems from present or perfect stems with alleged future semantics (as done by Hackstein, 2004, 90ff.) or by taking the subjunctive for a "Nichtvergangenheitsform des

punktuellen Aspekts" which took on future semantics as in Slavic (as done by Winter, 1961, 89 = 1984, 160 = 2005, 28; 1977, 147f. = 1984, 193 = 2005, 184f.; Winter, 1982, 9 = 1984, 228f. = 2005, 259; 1994a, 286f. = 2005, 467f. and apparently already by Couvreur, 1947a, 73 and 103, § 122), which, among other things, would not account for the modal use of the subjunctive forms.

16.2.   MORPHOLOGY

Much as the functions of the Tocharian so-called subjunctive are the ones found with the Vedic and Homeric subjunctives, with respect to morphology it radically differs from its Indo-Iranian and Ancient Greek functional equivalents, and the PIE subjunctive as usually reconstructed on the basis of Indo-Iranian and Ancient Greek. As correctly stated by Hackstein, 2004, 89: "Spuren grundsprachlicher themavokalischer Konjunktivbildungen sind Mangelware", and most probably do not exist at all; see Peters, 2006, 334f., fn. 16 against the existence of Tocharian subjunctives from PIE subjunctives; the Sub I/II of *käm-* does not reflect the PIE subjunctive $*g^ʷem\text{-}e/o\text{-}$, but the PIE non-Narten root aorist $*g^ʷem\text{-}t$ (> pre-PT $*g^ʷen\text{-}t$), $*g^ʷm\text{-}ent$, see chap. Sub II 19.2.; against Peters, 2006, 336f., fn. 18, it is also quite unlikely that some PIE subjunctive stems resulted in Tocharian present stems.[1]

16.2.1.   *Synchrony*

As a rule, a Tocharian subjunctive stem is either identical with (one of) the respective present stem(s), or less complex than the respective present stem(s), i.e., the functionally marked category subjunctive tends to be less marked with respect to morphology than the functionally unmarked category present; see Winter, 1977, 136 = 1984, 181 = 2005, 173; Hartmann, 2001, 100f.; Hackstein, 2004, 91; Peters, 2006, 335ff.

---

[1] See also Jasanoff, 1998, 312, fn. 48: "The PIE subjunctive was normally lost without a trace in Tocharian. [...] late PIE forms of the type 3 sg. $*pék^ʷset(i)$ may have had both the standard subjunctive reading 'may cook' and an indicative reading 'wishes to cook' or 'sets about cooking' ...".

16.2.2. *Diachrony*

Most of the various subjunctive formations of Tocharian clearly go back to PIE present stem formations. This holds at least for the subjunctive Classes II, IV, VI, IX, X, XI, and XII, while things are different with respect to Classes I and V. As already noticed by TG, 325 and 341, many members of these two subjunctive classes look (at least at a first glance) like the respective preterit forms (scil. Pt III and Pt I forms, respectively) provided with primary endings. It is therefore understandable that with regard to the Sub I and V scholars like Couvreur, Winter, and Kim claimed that "the 'subjunctive' in Tocharian is merely the non-past of the perfective (punctual) stem" (see the references given above). However, such a view cannot offer an immediate explanation for the question why all kinds of so-called subjunctives of Tocharian evidently carry all kinds of functions otherwise met with the regular outcomes of the PIE *-e/o- subjunctives in branches such as Indo-Iranian and Greek, and this is also true for even more atomistic solutions put forward by Rasmussen and Hackstein, learned, elaborate, and sophisticated as they certainly are. What we need is a unified theory about the origin of the Tocharian subjunctive classes, and such a theory can, in my opinion, be achieved if one assumes that (1) pre-Proto-Tocharian lost the PIE *-e/o- subjunctives, precisely as Anatolian did, and as a consequence used its present indicatives in the functions of the PIE subjunctives, also precisely as Anatolian did; and (2) that all subjunctive formations of the historical Tocharian languages had started out as pre-PT *present indicative* formations. As for assumption (2), at least with respect to most of the Class I and all of the Class V subjunctives, just two further assumptions need to be made: (a) pre-Proto-Tocharian also lost the PIE imperfect-aorist distinction, precisely as Anatolian did; (b) pre-Proto-Tocharian as a consequence formed new presents from old aorist stems (and in all probability also old perfect stems turned into simple preterit stems) by what I would like to call the *tēzzi* principle, again precisely as Anatolian did.

16.2.3. *The tēzzi principle*

Even two scholars who have as different opinions about the origin of the Anatolian verbal system as Eichner (e.g., 1975, 81, 88, 93) and Jasanoff (most recently 2003) agree with respect to the claim that in Anatolian, or more precisely, at least in Proto-Hittite, new present

stems could be formed to already existing preterits (preterits which were not, of course, old imperfects still coexisting with the present stems they originally belonged to) simply by substituting the synchronic primary endings for the secondary endings met in the respective preterits,[2] "a trivial step once the functional distinction between the PIE imperfect and aorist had been lost in Proto-Anatolian", as per Jasanoff, 2003, 151. Both scholars also agree that Hittite *tēzzi* 'says' is an eminent case in point, see Jasanoff, 2003, 3: "The *mi*-conjugation also includes a few inherited root aorists in *-*m*, *-*s*, *-*t*. Following the loss of the imperfect : aorist distinction in Proto-Anatolian, these were reinterpreted as simple 'preterites' and provided with back-formed presents in *-*mi*, *-*si*, *-*ti*. The clearest instance of such an aorist-based *mi*-verb is *tē*- 'say' (pres. 3 sg. *tēzzi* = Lyc. *tadi* 'puts'), the Hittite reflex of the PIE root aorist *$dh\acute{e}h_1$-m*, *-*s*, *-*t* 'put'." Note that according to many scholars even the Vedic *tudáti* present type is best explained that way, see, e.g., Rasmussen, 1997, 148f.

---

[2] The same principle for Tocharian was already invoked by Peters, 2004, 434, fn. 24.

THE PRIVATIVE

17.1. MORPHOLOGY AND FUNCTION

The privative is synchronically associated with the subjunctive stem, cf. TEB I, 192f., § 334,2. Hilmarsson, 1994, 47ff. has shown that the privative is sometimes even based on a more original subjunctive stem different from the productive one. He also argues that if the subjunctive shows ablaut, it is always the zero-grade stem variant from which the privative is derived. On the alleged exception *atraikatte* from *trik*[(a)]- 'go astray', see chap. Sub I/V 18.2.5. A more original subjunctive stem class is certainly to be seen in the case of Priv *eṅkälpatte* that is based on an *ā*-subjunctive stem *kälpā*- 'obtain', while the productive subjunctive stem is of Class VI in Tocharian B, whereas Tocharian A still preserves the finite Class V subjunctive (cf. Hilmarsson, 1994, 74f.).

17.1.1.   *The privative and the accent of the subjunctive stem*

Hilmarsson, 1991, 18ff. and 195ff.; 1994, 47ff. claims a relationship between the behavior of the nasal of the privative prefix and the accent of the subjunctive stem from which it is derived, and this view has generally been followed, most recently by Schaffner, 2006, 167 with fn. 96. According to Hilmarsson, this pattern is further confined to roots beginning with *k* and *p*. While the prefixed nasal is always retained before roots in root-initial vowels and lost before root-initial consonants other than *k* and *p*, he assumes that preservation and loss of the nasal in roots beginning with *k* and *p* depends on the accent: initial accent caused loss of the nasal and non-initial accent caused preservation of the nasal.

The following table lists all relevant examples; the second and fourth column show the attested subjunctive stem and its accent pattern (according to my own survey):

	Lost nasal		Retained nasal	
akākatte	*kāk^a-* Sub V initial acc.[1]	*eṅkärstātte* (MQ)	*kärst^a-* Sub V, ablaut, initial acc.	
ekätkätte (MQ)	*kätk^(a)-* Sub V, ablaut, both acc.s	*eṅkälpatte*	*kälp^(a)-* *Sub V (Sub VI)	
ekamätte	*käm-* Sub II	*aṅklautkatte*	*klautk^(a)-* Sub V, initial acc.	
ekältte (MQ)	*käl-* Sub I, ablaut, *initial acc.	*eṅklyauṣäcce*	*klyaus-* Sub II	
ekwalatte	*kul^a-* Sub V, non-initial acc.	*empakwaccai* (MQ)	*päkw-* Sub I, non-initial acc.	
akautacce	*kaut^a-* Sub V, initial acc.	*empalkaitte*	?	
akraupatte	*kraup^(a)-* Sub V, initial acc.	*amplākätte*	*plāk-* Sub I, no ablaut, acc.?	
apāṣṣätte	*pāsk-* Sub II			

As can be seen, the facts do not really fit the pattern claimed by Hilmarsson. Accordingly, he tried to explain the exceptions to the alleged rule by assuming that the original subjunctive stems had a different accent scheme from the attested one. However, this assumption is far from likely for most cases in point.

As for *ekätkātte* 'not crossing' from *kätk^(a)-* 'cross', Hilmarsson, 1991, 63f. claims that the different accents attested in this subjunctive stem are due to valency alternation, the transitive having initial accent (hence nasalless Priv, because the privative has transitive meaning), the intransitive suffix accent. However, as is argued in chap. Sub I/V 18.4.3., the few attestations of different accent forms in Sub V stems cannot be explained by mere valency alternation (with the possible exception of the Inf *mrauskatsi*, see chap. Sub I/V 18.3.2.). On the other hand, the root *kätk^(a)-* 'cross, pass' is one of the few roots that show both transitive and intransitive use in the grundverb without any marking at all (see the detailed discussion of the passages in chap. Valency 4.4.1.). Finally, whether the middle subjunctive stem formation *kätkoytär-me* in 11 a 3f. is intransitive at all is far from clear.

As for *ekamätte* from *käm-* 'come', the athematic subjunctive stem from which it is derived is not attested, but it is likely that it had ablaut and initial accent like most Class I subjunctives, and the same is true for *ekältte* from *käl-* 'bear' showing ablaut but no unambiguous initial accent.

---

[1] Except 1.sg.mid. *kakāmar.*

In order to explain *ekwalatte* 'unrelenting, unabating' being an exception from his rule, Hilmarsson, 1991, 64ff. sets up an unattested active subjunctive stem *kwálā- beside an ablauting middle stem *kwälá-. However, as is argued in detail in chap.s Sub I/V 18.4.2. and Prs III/IV 26.2.3., intransitive Class III present stems such as *kul*^{*a*}- usually show neither active subjunctive forms in the grundverb nor initial accent, and if they do the whole verb shows irregular behavior, which is not the case with *kul*^{*a*}-.

As for *apāṣṣätte* from *pāsk-* standing beside a synchronic Sub II, Hilmarsson, 1991, 116f. assumes a former *sk*-less stem *pā- that was only later replaced by a Class IX present, i.e., he sets up a suffixal *sk*-stem *pā-sk-*. However, *pāsk-* clearly behaves like the other inherited *sk*-roots (< PIE *sk̂e/o*-presents), and not like a secondary Tocharian *sk*-root at all.[2]

Two of the forms with preserved nasal have subjunctive stems with initial accent (*eṅkärstātte* from *kärst*^{*a*}-, *aṅklautkatte* from *klautk*^(*a*)-), and are hence counterexamples to Hilmarsson's rule, while for just one example the predicted non-initial accent is attested with certainty in the respective subjunctive stem of Class I. Here, again, Hilmarsson has to assume unattested subjunctive forms with non-initial accent for both *kärst*^{*a*}- 'cut' and *klautk*^(*a*)- 'turn'. However, in both cases such an assumption is unlikely even from a theoretical point of view, because roots with full vowels (or roots with generalized persistent full grade in the subjunctive stem) hardly ever have non-initial accent in the *ā*-subjunctive. There are even middle forms attested in the Sub V of *kärst*^{*a*}-, and they do not show initial accent either.

It is uncertain whether *empalkaitte*[3] belongs to *pälk*^{*a*}- 'see' (as per WTG, 43) or to *pälk*^(*a*)- 'burn'. To be sure, the subjunctive stem of *pälk*^{*a*}-

---

[2] See chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.6. and on this special root also chap. *tk*-Roots, fn. 4. Hilmarsson could claim this because he followed Marggraf's views (1970, 22f.) on the accent, but see on that question also my general discussion of accent in chap. Sub I/V 18.4.3.

[3] Note that although the suffix allomorph *-ai-* instead of *-a-* can in most cases be explained with Hilmarsson as a reflex of the informal/eastern sound change *ä/ā* > *ai* in front of palatals (i.e., originating in the obliquus), the quite often attested Priv *empalkaitte* comes from texts of all provenances, i.e., it is not confined to eastern/informal-style documents (no MQ examples is attested). One may speculate whether in this case the informal variant *-ai-* was introduced quite early into the normal styles (though in post-MQ time) precisely in order to distinguish between a derivative of *pälkā-* 'see' and

'see' has initial accent, but Hilmarsson in any case prefers to derive it from *pälk*[(a)]- 'burn' for semantic reasons (1991, 71). The subjunctive stem of *pälk*[(a)]- 'burn' is unattested (only the Prs III of the grundverb is), but since we are dealing with a Prs III verb, the subjunctive should indeed have been a medium tantum with non-initial accent (see chap. Prs III/IV 26.2.3.). If the form is rather to be derived from *pälk*[a]- 'see', Hilmarsson has no problem with his theory either, because he assumes a pre-TB middle Sub V stem with suffix accent **pälkā́*- on the basis of the all-middle subjunctive stem in Tocharian A. Although this cannot be excluded, nothing is gained by it, because such an unattested subjunctive **pälkā́*- 'see' would be homonymic with **pälkā́*- 'burn' in any case, and that homonymy may precisely have been the reason for the active inflection of the Sub V *pälkā*- 'see' (and likewise of the preterit) in contrast to medium tantum [A]*pälk*[a]- 'see'.[4]

Note furthermore as a typological parallel that in Italian dialects of Northern Italy -*NC*- clusters can only escape nasal loss either if -*C*- was voiced (Tuttle, 1991, 25f.), or if the accent was placed precisely on the syllable *that followed immediately upon the cluster* (e.g., *mut* but *muntàgna* 'mountain'; see Tuttle 1991, 53f.).

According to Jay Jasanoff (as reported and followed by Ringe, 1996, 72), the negative prefix lost its nasal in front of *sC clusters by regular sound change, and then the form of the prefix without the nasal spread to other roots by analogy (but note Ringe's own remark that "examples to roots beginning in *sC clusters are rare").

On the other hand, in an archaic IE language so well documented as Ancient Greek, there existed a somehow related, although reverse, tendency to develop so-called parasitic nasals in front of stops, and those nasals showed up only sporadically, so that it seems quite

---

pälkā- 'burn'. Instead of such an analogical introduction, one may also assume a metathesis of palatalization *-l'CāC- to -*lCāyC*-; on such processes of metathesis see chap. Sound Laws 1.7.

Hilmarsson's judgment that *empālkatte* from the MQ text 281 has no linguistic value is certainly correct. Although the manuscript has common archaic ductus (see in general Malzahn, 2007a, 255ff.; this text has by mistake been omitted from the list on p. 264), it does not necessarily contain more archaic linguistic traits, because it shows unmistakably many misspellings (such as the confusion of sibilants or nasals), so that one must conclude that the scribe in question was very inexperienced (and that the text was dictated rather than copied).

[4] On the voice alternation in [A]*pälk*[a]- 'see' and related roots see chap. Voice 5.2.2.2.

impossible to discover any phonological conditioning; see Schulze, 1895 = 1934, 281ff., and especially his final conclusion "die Regel ist Regellosigkeit"; for the extremely frequent non-writing of nasals before stops in documents of Ancient Greek see now Méndez Dosuna, 2007, 355ff.

In sum, it is far from obvious that the accent of the related subjunctive stem could trigger the loss or preservation of the nasal in privative forms, so I am reluctant to use the privative as evidence for the accent in the subjunctive stem.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE OF CLASSES I AND V

Class I is a simple athematic formation, whereas Class V stems always end in PT *-ā-. Both classes can show the same root ablaut pattern in both Tocharian A and B, viz. PT *æ < pre-PT *o in the active singular on the one hand and PT *ä from a pre-PT zero grade in the active plural, in the entire middle, in the whole optative and in all the non-finite forms built from the subjunctive stem on the other hand. Accordingly, both classes are treated here together. Tocharian B in addition shows different accent patterns including irregular initial accent. Synchronically irregular initial accent is also occasionally attested in the morphologically related presents of Class V, but not in the presents of Class I; however, such irregular initial accent is met with presents of Class V only when the respective Sub V stem shows the same kind of ablaut.

18.1.   SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT SUBJUNCTIVE CLASS I

The athematic subjunctive Class I is in historical times clearly a recessive class, while the subjunctive of Class V is the most productive subjunctive class in both languages (made from 156 roots in Tocharian B and 112 roots in Tocharian A). A subjunctive of Class I is merely attested for 48 TB roots with certainty. In Tocharian A this class is even less attested (nine roots in total), because most former athematic subjunctives of Class I seem to have been replaced by Class VII subjunctives. In both languages, some of the remaining Class I subjunctives have also transferred thematic endings to the paradigm.

Apart from the exceptional 1.sg. active ending -*m* of *yam*, the regular athematic 1.sg. active ending in Tocharian B is -*u*, and the thematic ending is -*au* (cf. Lane, 1959, 161). There is no analogically introduced thematic ending -*au* attested in the Sub I stems (unlike the situation encountered in the corresponding athematic present stems of Class I, where we find a secondary thematic 1.sg.act. *nesau* from *nes-* 'be'). On the other hand, in the Class I subjunctives one finds in the 1.pl.act. thematic -*em* standing beside athematic -*äm* (or -*mo* with *o* mobile), and in the 3.pl.act. respective -*eṃ* beside athematic -*äṃ*, cf.

TEB I, 222, § 401,1; Schmidt, 1985, 429. Note that in the athematic present stem Class I the thematic 1.pl.act. ending *-em* is, in fact, the only ending to be found, while in the athematic subjunctive the expected athematic ending is still attested.

The following 50 verbs form a subjunctive of Class I (48 TB, 9 TA, 7 TA = TB):

ār⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'leave, abandon', *āl⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'keep away, hold in check', *i-* 'go' (Sub I + II), *eṅk-* 'seize', *er-* 'evoke, cause', *ai-* 'give, take'/ *ᴬe-* 'give' (Sub I + II), *auk-* '± set in motion', *au-n-* 'hit, wound, begin', *kän⁽ᵃ⁾-* mid. 'come about, occur', *käl-* 'bear, endure', *käs-* act. 'quench, extinguish', mid. 'come to extinction', *ku-* 'pour, offer a libation', *kau-* 'destroy, kill'/ *ᴬko-* 'kill' (Sub I + II), *kläṅk-* 'doubt', *täk-* 'touch', *täṅk-/ ᴬtäṅk-* 'hinder', *träṅk-* 'lament', *treṅk-/ ᴬträṅk-* 'cling, stick', *nāk-* 'blame', *näk-/ ᴬnäk-* act. 'destroy, lose', mid. 'fall into ruin, disappear' (TB Sub I + II), *näm-* act. 'bend', mid. 'bow', *nes-/ ᴬnas-* 'be', *päkw-* 'rely on, trust', *pärk-/ ᴬpärk-* 'ask, beg', *putk-* 'shut', *pyāk-* 'strike, beat', *plāk-* 'agree', *plätk-* 'overflow, develop, arise', *plu-* 'float, fly, soar', *ᴬmärk-* 'smudge, besmirch', *yām-* 'do' (Sub I + II), *yäp-* 'enter; set (sun)', *yänm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'achieve, reach', *yok-* 'drink', *räk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'extend', *räṅk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'ascend', *ri-n-* 'leave, give up', *ru-* 'open', *läṅk-* Antigv. act. 'hang up', *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'separate, decide, command' (Sub I + II), *wäs-* 'don, wear', *si-n-* 'satiate oneself, be depressed', *sai-n-* 'lean on, rely on', *smi-* 'smile', *ᴬspärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'get lost', *tsäk-* 'burn', *tsäṅk-* 'flay', *tsärk-* 'burn, torture', *tsuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. '± suckle; foster'. Uncertain are: *aiw⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'turn to' (Sub I/II), *kāñm²-* '± be merry' (Sub I/II/V), *kätt-* 'put, set (down)' (Sub I/II), *kälm-* '± enable' (Sub I/II), *krämp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'disturb, hinder' (Sub I/II), *kli-n-/ ᴬkli-n-* 'be obliged to' (Sub I/II), *cäṅk-* 'please' (Sub I/II), *täl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'carry' (?), *tälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'purge' (Sub I/II), *päl-* 'listen closely' (Sub I/II), *yärp-* 'take care, look out' (Sub I/II), *ᴬwäs-* 'don' (Sub I/V?), *wi-* 'frighten' (Sub I/II), *tsäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'cause to grow, increase' (Sub I/II), *ᴬtsāk-* 'glow' (Sub I/II).

A former athematic subjunctive stem has further to be set up for *aik-* 'know' (II/II/III) on the evidence of the Priv *anaiktai*, for *käm-* 'come' (Xa/II/III-VI) on the evidence of the Priv *ekamätte*, and for *ᴬsi-n-* 'satiate' (X/VII/III) on the evidence of the Priv TA *asinät*.

18.1.1. *Tocharian A*

ᴬe- 'give' has a thematic 3.pl.act. TA *āyeñc*, and similarly *ᴬko-* 'kill' has a thematic 3.pl.act. TA *kāweñc*, but both stems should nevertheless basically be analyzed as athematic ones due to diachronic considerations. The introduction of precisely a thematic 3.pl.active ending into an athematic paradigm is also attested for the athematic present stem of *ᴬken-*, and is even more often attested in Tocharian B,

both for athematic subjunctive and present stems of Class I; see also
the discussion by Hackstein, 1995, 150ff. Apart from ᴬe-, ᴬko-, and
ᴬnäk- there are only finite middle forms and non-finite forms attested
in the TA Sub I with certainty:

	Sub I	Thematized
1.sg.act.	*em*	
2.sg.act.	*et, nakät*	
3.sg.act.	*eṣ, koṣ*	
1.pl.act.	—	
2.pl.act.	—	
3.pl.act.	—	*āyeñc, kāweñc*
1.sg.mid.	*pärkmār*	
2.sg.mid.	—	
3.sg.mid.	*träṅktär*	
1.pl.mid.	—	
2.pl.mid.	*pärkcär*	
3.pl.mid.	*pärkäntär*	
Ger	*el, nasäl*	
Abs	*elune, kolune, täṅklune, träṅklune, naslune, pärklune, märklune*	

18.1.2.   *Tocharian B*

	Sub I	Thematized
1.sg.act.	*yam, āyu, kelu, kewu, neku-me, preku, yāmu, yopu, yoku*	
2.sg.act.	*yat, ait, yāmt, rewät*	
3.sg.act.	*oräñ-c, yaṃ, aiṃ, ewkän-me* (MQ), *auṃ, kowän, tekäṃ-me, teṅkäñ-c, prekäṃ-ne, plākäṃ, pletkäṃ, plyewä-ñ, yāmäṃ, yokäṃ, yopäṃ-ne, yonmäṃ, wotkäṃ*	
1.pl.act.	*aiymo,[1] pūtkäm* (MQ), *ruwäm* (MQ), *laṅkäm-c*	*nkem, yamem*
2.pl.act.	—	
3.pl.act.	*aiṃ, nakäṃ, parkän-me, yäpäṃ, yokäṃ*	*yaneṃ, yāmeṃ, wotkeṃ*

---

[1] The only *o*-mobile variant comes from a restored form *(aiy)m(o)* in 295 a
2. Although this would be the only rendering of former word-final *-ä by -*o* in
non-pāda final position in this manuscript, the restoration is nevertheless
possible, because the text has common archaic ductus, and in these texts
mobile *o* can be found in every position within a pāda; see Malzahn, 2007a,
275ff.

1.sg.mid.	*ermar, aimar, yāmmar*
2.sg.mid.	*ertar, yāmtar, rintar*
3.sg.mid.	*eṅktär, ertär, aitär, auntär, kantär-ñ,*
	kutär, piltär, yāmtär, rintär, wastär
1.pl.mid.	*yamamtär*
2.pl.mid.	—
3.pl.mid.	*wräntär, eṅkantär, eräntär* (MQ),
	aunantär, yamantär, sainäntär (MQ)
Ger II	*eṅkälle, erlona, aille, nesalle, parkälle,*
	pyākäle, plākälle (MQ), *yamalle, rilye,*
	saille, smīlle, tsärkalle, tsukäle
Abstr II	*eṅkalñe, erälyñe, ailñe, kwälñe,*
	kāwälñe/kāwalyñe, klaṅkälyñe,
	takälñe, träṅkalyñe, nākälyñe,
	namalñe/nmalyñe, nesalyñe, pkwalñe,
	pyākälyñe (MQ), *pluwälyñe, yamalñe,*
	yapälñe rilñe, silñe, smilñe, tsäkalñe,
	tsärkalñe
Inf	*āltsi, yatsi, eṅktsi, ertsi, aitsi, kaltsi,*
	kastsi, kautsi, klaṅktsi, taṅktsi, nāktsi,
	naktsi, nestsi, paksi, parktsi, pyāktsi,
	plāktsi, yāmtsi, yaptsi, raktsi, raṃktsi,
	rintsi, wastsi, saintsi, tsaṅtsi

18.1.2.1. *Accent and ablaut*

Ablauting subjunctives of Class I usually show persistent initial accent, which cannot be explained by any of the basic rules of TB accentuation, cf., e.g., the 3.sg.act. with enclitic pronoun *tekäṃ-me* as opposed to the same kind of formation made from a thematic subjunctive (Class II) *śman-me* (from *śämáṃ-me*), and from a thematic present *cäñcan-me*. Such ablauting subjunctives are regularly made from roots with *-ä-* as root vowel (cf. also TA 2.sg. *nakät* ~ TB 1.sg. *neku-me*), and show ablaut between the active singular (PT *æ*-grade) on the one hand and active plural, middle and non-finite forms (zero grade) on the other hand, so that they seem to reflect a pre-PT ablaut *o*-grade/zero grade[2] just like the one to be seen in the ablauting Sub V formations. There is, however, a noticeable difference between

---

[2] As for the ablaut *nek-/näk-*, Jasanoff, e.g., 2003, 201, wants to derive it from an *o*-grade/*e*-grade ablaut *noḱ-/neḱ-*; again differently Rasmussen, 1997, 150, who states that a zero-grade *ṇḱ- > *änk-* may have been analogically remade into *näk-*, a view also shared by Ringe, 1990, 215; see below 18.6.1.2. in detail.

the accent patterns of Sub I and Sub V. Whereas all *ā*-subjunctive stems with persistent (*)-*ā*- in the root show initial accent in the whole stem (i.e., also in the plural active, the entire middle and in non-finite forms), the picture with respect to Sub I is quite different almost without exception. The following full-vowel roots show initial accent:

er- 'evoke, cause' (tr) (x/x/m) (VIII/I/III): beside ambiguous forms there is the Abstr II *erälyñe*; as for the abstract variants *kāwälñe* (M) and *kāwalyñe* (Š) from *kau-* 'destroy, kill' (tr) (x/a/a) (VIII/I/III), I propose that *kāwalyñe* is just a misspelling, i.e., due to omission of the *ä*-dots over the ⟨wa⟩, and hence attests to initial accent; *nāk-* 'blame' (tr) (m/-/m) (VIII/I/III) has the Abstr *nākälyñe*; as for *pyāk-* 'strike, beat' (tr) (-/a/a) (-/I/III), a Ger II *pyākäle* is attested in a gloss to a Paris Sanskrit text (Couvreur, 1970, 182), and since there are also the Opt forms *pyāśim-me* and *pyāśi-ne* attested (both from non-MQ texts), we are dealing with a subjunctive with persistent initial accent. *ār*^(ä)- Antigv. 'leave, abandon' apparently shows ablaut (although a different kind from that of the non-full vowel roots: finite Sub *or-*, Opt and non-finite *ār-*), and both the 3.sg.act. *oräñ-c* with enclitic pronoun and the 3.pl.mid. *wräntär* (for *oräntär, metrical) attest to initial accent. The same kind of ablaut seems to be attested for *wätk*^(ä)- 'separate, decide' with 3.sg.act. *wotkäṃ*, 3.pl.act. *wotkeṃ* (thematized).

On the other hand, other full-vowel roots have Class I subjunctive forms without persistent initial accent: *au-n-* 'hit, wound', 'begin' has a 3.pl.mid. *aunantär*; *nes-* 'be' has *nesalle* and *nesalyñe*; all trisyllabic forms[3] from *yām-* 'do' have accent on the second syllable (3.pl.mid. *yamantär*, etc.); *yok-* 'drink' has the abstract *yokalyñe*. The optative of *ai-* 'give' 3.sg. *ayi-ne*, 3.sg.mid. *ayītär* also clearly speaks in favor of non-initial accent. Finally, *eṅk-* 'seize, take, understand' (tr) (m+/m/m) (IXa/I/III) shows one form with initial, and two with non-initial accent: 3.pl.mid. *eṅkantär*, Abstr *eṅkalñe* beside Ger II *eṅkälle*. The stem formation of both *aiw*^(ä)- Antigv. 'turn to', and *kāñm-* '± be merry' is unclear, and only ambiguous forms are attested for *auk-* '± set in motion', *treṅk-* 'cling, stick', *plāk-* 'agree', and *sai-n-* 'lean on'.

As for roots with root vowel (*)*ä*, the following cases show more or less persistent initial accent and/or ablaut:

---

[3] This definition includes, of course, also the 1.pl.act. *yamem*, but not the 2.sg.act. *yāmt*, because of the regular *ä*-loss in front of a -*t*-, -*s*-, and -*ts*-.

käl- 'bear, endure' (tr) (a/a/x) (VIII/I/III) 1.sg. *kelu*, Inf *kaltsi*; *ku-* 'pour, offer a libation' (tr) (a/x/a) (VIII/I/III) 1.sg. *kewu*, 3.sg.mid. *kutär*, Abstr II *kwälñe*; *kläṅk-* 'doubt' (tr) (m/-/-) (I/I/III) Abstr *klaṅkälyñe*; *täk-* 'touch' (tr) (a/a/a) (II/I/III) 3.sg. *tekäṃ-me*, 1.sg. Opt *taśim*, 3.sg. Opt *taśi*, 3.pl. Opt *taśyeṃ*, Abstr *takälñe*; *täṅk-* 'hinder' (tr) (x/a/-) (II-VIII/I/III) 3.sg. *teṅkäñ-c*, Inf *taṅktsi*, 3.sg. Opt *tañci*; *näk-* 'destroy, fall into ruin' (tr/itr) (x/x/x) (VIII/I-III/III) 1.sg. *neku-me*, 1.pl. *nkem*, 3.pl. *nakäṃ*, Inf *naktsi*; *pärk-* 'ask, beg' (tr) (x/a/x) (VIII/I/III) 1.sg. *preku*, 3.sg. *prekäṃ-ne*, 3.pl. *parkän-me*, 2.sg. Opt *parśit*, 3.sg. Opt *parśi-ne*, Ger II *parkälle*; *plätk-* 'overflow, arise' (itr) (-/a/a) (II/I/III) 3.sg. *pletkäṃ*, 3.pl. Opt *placyeṃ*; *plu-* 'float, fly, soar' (itr) (a/a/a) (VIII/I/III) 3.sg. *plyewä-ñ*, 3.sg. Opt *pluwi*, Abstr II *pluwälyñe*; *yäp-* 'enter, set (sun)' (itr) (a+/a/a) (I-Xa/I/III) 1.sg. *yopu*, 3.sg. *yopäṃ-ne*, 3.pl. *yäpäṃ* (MQ), 1.sg. Opt *yapim*, 2.sg. Opt *yapit*, 3.sg. Opt *yapi*, 3.pl. Opt *yäpyem* (MQ), Abstr II *yapälñe*; *yänm*[(a)]- 'achieve, reach' (tr) (x/x/a) (Xa/I-VI/III) 3.sg. *yonmäṃ*; *tsuk*[(a)]- Antigv. '± suckle, foster' (tr) (a/-/a) (VIII/I/III) Ger II *tsukäle*.

Here probably also belong *ru-* 'open' (tr/itr) (m/x/-) (VIII/I-III/III) with 2.sg.act. *rewät*, and *wätk*[(a)]- Antigv. 'separate' which has a root vowel *-o-* both in the 3.sg.act. *wotkäṃ*, and also in the thematic-looking 3.pl.act. *wotkeṃ*. For *näm-* 'bend', 'bow' (tr/itr) (x/m/x) (VIII/I-III/III) there is no ablaut attested, but initial accent in the Abstr *namalñe*.

On the other hand, the following non-full vowel roots do not show initial accent:

träṅk- 'lament' (tr) (-/a/a) (I/I-II/I) Abstr II *träṅkalyñe*; *päkw-* 'rely on, trust' (tr) (m/-/-) (I-XII/I/-) Abstr II *pkwalñe*; *tsäk-* 'burn' (tr/itr) (x/m/x) (VIII/I-III/III) Abstr II *tsäkalñe*; *tsärk-* (tr) (a/-/-) (IXa/I-II/III) Ger II *tsärkalle*, Abstr II *tsärkalñe*.

As for *träṅk-* and *tsärk-*, the non-initial accent can in theory just be due to influence of the thematic subjunctive stem attested beside the athematic one, and similarly the accent of *päkw-* may be said to be due to the athematic present stem found beside it (if the abstract *pkwalñe* is not simply to be analyzed as an Abstr I of the present stem in the first place, although Abstr I is not attested too often). 1.pl. *nkem* has a thematic ending. This would just leave *tsäk-* 'burn' with an unexpected non-initial accent, and it cannot be excluded that *tsäk-* 'burn' also had a (newly created) thematic subjunctive stem beside Sub I. However, the most economic solution will be, of course, to take

all these forms simply for Sub I forms attesting to a more archaic accentual pattern with initial accent only in the sg. active.

Ambiguous with respect to accent/ablaut pattern are *āl⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'hold in check', *i-* 'go', *kän⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'occur',[4] *käs-* 'quench', *pil-* 'listen', *putk-* 'shut', *räk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'extend', *räṅk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'ascend', *ri-n-* 'leave', *läṅk-* Antigv. act. 'hang up', *wäs-* 'don', *si-n-* 'satiate', *smi-* 'smile', and *tsäṅk-* 'flay'.

18.1.2.2. *The infinitive*

In infinitives from thematic subjunctives of Class II, a cluster consisting of a palatalized root-final consonant and the ending-initial *-ts-* may undergo reduction and assimilation, as in, e.g., *ākṣtsi > āksi*, cf. TEB I, 224, § 404,2, and see chap. Sub II 19.1.3. However, it is quite impossible to take the Inf *ramktsi* from *räṅk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'ascend' and the Inf *tsaṅtsi* from *tsäṅk-* 'flay' for forms of the *aissi* kind, so that they must be Sub I forms, much as the Inf *raktsi* attested beside a clear thematic Sub II 3.sg. *rāśäṃ*, as rightly claimed by Hackstein, 1995, 120.

18.2.   SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT SUBJUNCTIVE CLASS V

A subjunctive of Class V is made with certainty from 192 roots (157 TB, 112 TA, 77 TB = TA).

āks^ᵃ- 'waken', *ār⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬār⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cease', *ārt(t)⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬārt^ᵃ-* 'love, praise', *ālp^ᵃ-* 'stroke', *ᴬās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'dry (out)', *ᴬeṃts⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'seize', *ausw^ᵃ-* '± cry', *iy^ᵃ-* 'go, travel', *ᴬkary-* 'laugh', *kāk^ᵃ-/ ᴬkāk^ᵃ-* 'call', *ᴬkātk^ᵃ-* 'arise', *kānt^ᵃ-* 'rub', *kānts^ᵃ-* 'sharpen', *ᴬkām^ᵃ-* 'carry', *kār^ᵃ-* 'gather', *kārp⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬkārp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'descend', *kāw^ᵃ-/ ᴬkāp^ᵃ-* 'desire', *kät^ᵃ-* 'strew', *kätk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬkätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cross', *kän⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'fulfill (a wish)', *kärk^ᵃ-* 'rob', *kärr^ᵃ-* 'scold', *kärs⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬkärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'know', *kärst^ᵃ-/ ᴬkärṣt^ᵃ-* 'cut off', *käl^ᵃ-/ ᴬkäl^ᵃ-* 'lead', *ᴬkälk^ᵃ-* 'go', *ᴬkälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'obtain', *käl(t)s^ᵃ-/ ᴬkäl(t)s^ᵃ* '(op)press', *kälsk^ᵃ-* 'disappear', *käsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'scatter', *kul^ᵃ-/ ᴬkul^ᵃ-* 'recede', *ᴬkoṣt^ᵃ-* 'hit', *kaut^ᵃ-/ ᴬkot^ᵃ-* 'split, cleave', *kraup⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬkrop⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'gather', *krämp⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬkrämp^ᵃ-* 'be hindered', *klāṅk^ᵃ-/ ᴬklāṅk^ᵃ-* 'go by wagon', *klāp^ᵃ-* '± touch', *klāy^ᵃ-/ ᴬklāw^ᵃ-* 'fall', *klänts⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬklis^ᵃ-* 'sleep', *klutk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'turn', *klaiks^ᵃ-/ ᴬkleps^ᵃ-* dry up', *klautk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬlotk^ᵃ-* 'turn', *kwäs^ᵃ-* 'lament', *tāk^ᵃ-/ ᴬtāk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be, become', *ᴬtāp^ᵃ-* 'eat', *tāpp^ᵃ-* '?', *ᴬtā(-s)-* 'put', *ᴬtäk^ᵃ-* 'touch', *ᴬtäkw^ᵃ-* '?', *täks^ᵃ-* '± destroy', *tätt^ᵃ-* 'put', *tärk^ᵃ-/ ᴬtärk^ᵃ-* 'dismiss', *(täl⁽ᵃ⁾-)/ᴬtäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'lift up', *tin⁽ᵃ⁾-* '± defile oneself', *tuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'hide oneself', *trāpp^ᵃ-* 'trip',

---

trāsk^a-/ ^{A}*trāsk^a*- 'chew', *trik$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*trik$^{(a)}$*- 'go astray', *triw$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*triw$^{(a)}$*- 'be mixed', *truk^a*- '± give', ^{A}*twāṅk^a*- '± wear, don', ^{A}*tw^a*-/^{A}*twās^a*- 'burn', *nān$^{(a)}$*- 'appear', *nāsk^a*- 'spin', *nätk^a*- 'hold distant', ^{A}*näm$^{(a)}$*- 'bow', *nitt$^{(a)}$*- 'collapse', *nu$^{(a)}$*- 'cry', *nuk^a*- 'swallow', *naut$^{(a)}$*-/ (^{A}*nut$^{(a)}$*-) 'disappear', *pātk^a*- 'give up', *pārāk$^{(a)}$*- 'prosper', *pās^a*- '± speak', *pänn^a*- 'stretch', *pärk^a*- '(a)rise', *pärs^a*- 'sprinkle', *pärsk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*pärsk$^{(a)}$*- 'be afraid', *päl^a*-/ ^{A}*päl^a*- 'praise', *pälk^a*-/ ^{A}*pälk^a*- 'see', *pälw^a*- 'lament', *pälsk^a*-/ ^{A}*päl(t)sk^a*- 'consider', *pi^a*- '± trumpet', *pik^a*-/ ^{A}*pik^a*- 'paint', *putk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*putk^a*- 'divide', *paut^a*-/ ^{A}*pot^a*- 'honor', *präṅk$^{(a)}$*- 'restrain oneself', *prutk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*prutk$^{(a)}$*- 'be shut', *pläṅk$^{(a)}$*- 'be for sale', ^{A}*plā*- '?', *plānt$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*plānt$^{(a)}$*- 'rejoice, be glad', ^{A}*pyāṣt$^{(a)}$*- 'be strong', *mān(t)s$^{(a)}$*- 'be sorrowful', ^{A}*mālk^a*- 'milk', ^{A}*māsk$^{(a)}$*- 'be difficult', *mäk$^{(a)}$*- 'run', *mäṅk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*mäṅk$^{(a)}$*- 'lack', *mänt$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*mänt^a*- 'stir, destroy', *märtk^a*- 'shave', *märs$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*märs^a*- 'forget', *mälk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*mälk^a*- '± put on', *mäsk^a*- 'be', *mätsts^a*- 'starve', *mit$^{(a)}$*- 'set out', *miw$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*miw^a*- 'tremble', *musk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*musk^a*- 'disappear', *mauk$^{(a)}$*- 'refrain from', *mrausk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*mrosk$^{(a)}$*- 'feel disgust', *mlut^a*- '± pluck', *mlutk^a*-/ ^{A}*mlusk^a*- 'escape', *yāṅk^a*-/ ^{A}*yāṅk^a*- 'be deluded', *yāt$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*yāt$^{(a)}$*- 'be (cap)able', *yäks^a*-/ ^{A}*yäks^a*- 'entangle', ^{A}*yu$^{(a)}$*- 'turn', *yuk$^{(a)}$*- 'overcome', ^{A}*yutk^a*- 'be worried', *yaukk^a*- 'use', *rāp^a*-/ ^{A}*räp^a*- 'dig', *räk$^{(a)}$*- 'extend', *räṅk$^{(a)}$*- 'ascend', *räm^a*- 'bend', ^{A}*räs^a*- 'stretch (out)', *räss$^{(a)}$*- 'tear', *riṅk^a*- '?', *rit^a*-/ ^{A}*rit^a*- 'seek', *ritt$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*ritw$^{(a)}$*- 'be attached', *rutk^a*-/ ^{A}*rutk^a*- '(re)move', *lātk^a*- 'cut off', *läk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*läk$^{(a)}$*- 'see', *läm$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*läm$^{(a)}$*- 'sit', *lik$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*lik$^{(a)}$*- 'wash', *lit^a*-/ ^{A}*lit$^{(a)}$*- 'fall', ^{A}*litk$^{(a)}$*- 'remove', *lip$^{(a)}$*- 'remain', *lu^a*-/ ^{A}*lu^a*- 'send', *luk$^{(a)}$*- 'light up', *lup$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*lup^a*- 'rub', ^{A}*ly^a*- 'wipe away (tears)', *wāk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*wāk$^{(a)}$*- 'split', *wāp^a*-/ ^{A}*wāp^a*- 'weave', *wāy^a*-/ ^{A}*wā*- 'lead', *wārk^a*- 'shear', *wāl^a*- 'cover', *wālts^a*- 'crush', *wāsk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*wāsk$^{(a)}$*- 'stir', *wät^a?*- 'fight', *wätk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*wätk$^{(a)}$*- 'decide', ^{A}*wänt^a*- 'cover', ^{A}*wäm^a*- '± set (sun)', *wär$^{(a)}$*- 'smell', *wärp^a*-/ ^{A}*wärp^a*- 'enjoy', *wik$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*wik$^{(a)}$*- 'disappear', ^{A}*wek^a*- 'break', *waiw$^{(a)}$*- 'be wet', *wrāt^a*-/ ^{A}*wrāt^a*- 'shape', *wlāw^a*-/ ^{A}*wlāw^a*- 'control', *śamp^a*- 'be conceited', *śuw^a*-/ ^{A}*śuw^a*- 'eat', ^{A}*sāk$^{(a)}$*- 'remain', *sānāp^a*- 'anoint', *sāmp$^{(a)}$*- 'take away', ^{A}*säk^a*- '± follow', *sätk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*sätk$^{(a)}$*- 'spread out', *särk$^{(a)}$*- '± take care of', *sälk^a*- 'pull', ^{A}*sälp^a*- 'glow', *sik^a*- 'step', ^{A}*sik$^{(a)}$*- 'be overflown', ^{A}*sip^a*- 'anoint', *siy^a*- 'sweat', ^{A}*sum^a*- 'take away', *suw^a*- /*swās^a*-/ ^{A}*suw$^{(a)}$*-/^{A}*swās$^{(a)}$*- 'rain', *skāy^a*-/ ^{A}*skāy^a*- 'strive', *skāw^a*- 'kiss', *skär^a*- 'scold', *stäm$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*ṣtäm$^{(a)}$*- 'stand', *spārtt$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*spārtw$^{(a)}$*- 'turn, behave', *spāw$^{(a)}$*- 'diminish', *spänt$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*spänt^a*- 'trust', *spärk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*spärk$^{(a)}$*- 'disappear', *sruk^a*- 'die', *swār^a*- 'please', *tsāk^a*- 'pierce', *tsärw$^{(a)}$*- 'be comforted', *tsālt^a*- 'chew', ^{A}*tsäk$^{(a)}$*- 'pull', *tsäṅk^a*- '(a)rise', ^{A}*tsän^a*- 'compose', *tsäm$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*tsäm$^{(a)}$*- 'grow', *tsär$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*tsär$^{(a)}$*- 'be separated', *tsälp$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*tsälp$^{(a)}$*- 'pass away', *tsik^a*- 'form', ^{A}*tsit$^{(a)}$*- 'touch', *tsuk$^{(a)}$*- 'suck (out)'/ ^{A}*tsuk^a*- 'drink'.

Uncertain are: *kāñm^a?*- '± be merry' (Sub I/II/V), ^{A}*wäs*- 'don' (Sub I/V?), *sälp^a?*- 'glow' (Sub V?).

	TB		TA
	Initial accent	Non-initial acc.	
1.sg.act.	*tākau*	*lakau*	*kalkam*
2.sg.act.	*tākat*	*lkāt*	*katkat*
3.sg.act.	*tākaṃ*	*lakaṃ*, *lkā-ne*	*kalkaṣ*
1.pl.act.	*tākam*	*lkām-c*	*kälkāmäs*
2.pl.act.	*tākacer*	*lkācer*	*kälkāc*
3.pl.act.	*tākaṃ*	*lakaṃ*	*kälkeñc*
1.sg.mid.	*ritamar*	*mlutkāmar*	*kälpāmār*
2.sg.mid.	*kalatar*	—	*kälpātār*
3.sg.mid.	*rītatär*	*lkātär*	*kälpātär*
1.pl.mid.	—	—	*kälpāmtär*
2.pl.mid.	—	—	*kälpācär*
3.pl.mid.	*ritantär*	*lkāntär*	*pälkāntär*
Ger II	*ritale*	*lkālye*	*kälpāl*
Abstr II	*rītalñe*	*lkālyñe*	*kälpālune*
Inf	*rītatsi*	*lkātsi*	

18.2.1.   *The replacement of stem-final -ā- by -ä- in TB*

Five 3.sg. active forms of what should be Sub V stems show the ending *-äṃ* instead of *-aṃ* (or *-āṃ*), and two Ger II forms show respective stem-final *-ä-* instead of *-ā-*:

3.sg. *krāstäṃ* in 33 a 3 (Š) from *kärst*[a]*-* 'cut'. WTG, 126, § 123 and TEB I, 230, § 413,3 analyzed the form as a Sub I or Sub II stem formation, although Krause himself stated that in the kind of paradigm that root has, a Sub I or II would be "auffällig", and that one would indeed expect a Sub V. Consequently, Cowgill, 1967, 178 = 2006, 449 assumed a mere misspelling for †*krāstaṃ* (most recently followed by Kim, 2007b, 88, fn. 43). However, ⟨ta⟩ for ⟨ta⟩ is not a likely misspelling from a paleographic point of view; 3.sg.act. *klāyä* (sic) for *klāyä<ṃ>*[5] instead of also attested *klāyaṃ* from *klāy*[a]*-* 'fall' in H 149.15 b 3 (non-MQ text); 3.sg.act. *naukäṃ-ne* from *nuk*[a]*-* 'swallow' in 407 a 2 (MQ) (analyzed as Sub V in WTG, 254; given as example of a writing *ä* for *a* in MQ texts in § 1,3a); 3.sg.act. *māntäṃ* from *mänt*[(a)]*-* 'stir, etc.' in 245 a

---

[5] The omission of the anusvāra dot on a sign already bearing two *ä*-dots is also attested elsewhere; cf. the 3.sg. Sub XII *täṅwä* for *täṅwä<ṃ>*, and see also Peyrot, 2008, 40, who states that the writing of three dots (i.e., *ä*-dots and anusvāra) over one sign is indeed "extremely rare".

5 (MQ)[6] (analyzed as Sub V by WTG, 266; given as example of a writing *ä* for *a* in MQ texts § 1,3a); 3.sg.act. *lāwä* (sic) from *lu^a-* 'send' in 316 a 2 (MQ), not "*lāwaṃ*" as per WTG, 284 (for the writing cf. *klāyä*); Ger II *tsaṅkälyai* and *tsäṅkälyi* in 552 (MQ) a 6 and b 4 from *tsäṅk^a-* 'arise'.

Although five of these seven forms come from MQ texts, this kind of writing is nevertheless diagnostic, because pace Krause, WTG, 1ff., § 1ff. the characteristic feature of MQ-character is not that the vowels *ä*, *a*, and *ā* are interchangeable, but that /ä/ is rendered by ⟨ä⟩ even under the accent, cf. now Peyrot, 2008, 34f. In fact, Krause, WTG, 4, § 1,3,a gave only very few examples for a rendering of underling /ā/ by ⟨ä⟩ in MQ texts, and it turns out that almost all certain examples come precisely from Sub V stems. As for the other examples invoked by Krause, all can be explained differently, so that it is simply not true that an underlying /ā/ can be rendered by ⟨ä⟩ in MQ texts at all (for the details see Malzahn, in print c).

18.2.2.   *Roots with full root vocalism*

All roots with full root vocalism, i.e., which show invariably *-ā-*, *-ai-*/ TA *-e-*, *-au-*/TA *-o-* as root vowel, never show paradigmatic ablaut in subjunctive Class V. In Tocharian B, almost all of them have persistent initial accent. In the singular active, initial accent is, of course, only to be seen in a form of the 2.sg., which had a desinence ending in a vowel, such as the 2.sg.act. *kārpat* 'you will descend', *klāyat* 'you will fall', *tākat* 'you will be', *lāmat* 'you will sit' (as opposed to non-initially accented 2.sg.act. *lkāt* 'you will see'), and also in cases where a 1. or 3.sg. is followed by an enclitic pronoun.

Note that in Tocharian B *naut^(a)-* 'disappear' only has *-au-* in all verbal forms, while ^A*nut^(a)-* only has *-u-*.

There are very few Sub V forms of roots/paradigms with persistent (*)-*ā-* as root vowel showing non-initial accent:
the 3.pl. *aran-me* (non-MQ text) from *ār^(a)-* 'cease' can hardly be a correct form at all and has to be some kind of misspelling in any case; the 1.sg. *kakāmar* attested beside many instances of *kāka-* forms from

---

[6] The manuscript has common archaic ductus; see in general Malzahn, 2007a, 264 (this manuscript was left out in the list presented there by mistake).

kāk^a- 'call' does not seem to come from an MQ text,[7] and the same is true for the Abstr *rapālñe* (attested beside initially accented Inf *rāpatsi*) from *rāp^a-* 'dig, plow' and for the two attestations of the Ger II *tsakāll(e)* from *tsāk^a-* 'pierce, bite'. *mrausk^(a)-* 'feel disgust' is a special problem. The Ger II *mrauskalye* and the Abstr II *mrauskalñe* are attested a couple of times in texts with standard orthography. Strictly speaking, these forms could be either explained as Sub V forms with initial accent, or as non-initially accented Sub I forms, and the attestation of the Ger II *m(r)ausk(a)lle* (neither a reading *mrauskälle* nor *mrauskälle* is possible) in the MQ text 572 b 4 argues strongly in favor of an analysis as initially accented *ā*-subjunctive; but beside these perfectly regular forms we find two attestations of finite *mrauskā-* from non-MQ texts (3.sg.mid. *mrauskātär*, 3.pl.mid. *mrauskāntär*, each attested just once). The Inf *mrauskatsi*, which has again *-a-*, is transitive and thereby also problematic (see below 18.3.2.).

With the exception of the two finite forms just mentioned from *mrausk^(a)-* and *kakāmar* and *rapālñe*, also all media tantum paradigms and paradigms with prevailing middle inflection of this class, i.e., from full-vowel roots, show persistent root-initial accent in Tocharian B:

ārt(t)^(a)- 'love', *kānt^a-* 'rub (away)', *kāw^a-* 'desire, crave', *kraup^(a)-* 'gather', (*klaiks^a-* 'dry up',) *yaukk^a-* 'use', *wlāw^a-* 'control'; note that the accent in both attestations of the Sub V from *nān^(a)-* 'appear' is uncertain.

18.2.3.   The *pārāk^a-* type

The Sub V forms of the disyllabic roots *pārāk^(a)-* 'prosper' and *sānāp^a-* 'anoint' show accent on the second *-ā-* from the left in the Inf forms *parākatsi* and *sanāpatsi*. *pārāk^(a)-* 'prosper' also has a kausativum Prs IXa stem *parākäsk-* with accent on the second *-ā-* from the left (while kausativa usually are of Class IXb). Since these two roots have two full vowels as root vowel, they are expected to conform to the pattern of full-vocalic roots, i.e., should show accent on the root, which they actually do, although not on the initial syllable like monosyllabic roots. These accents do, however, not show that in the case of initially

---

[7] PK AS 17C b 4f.: *y(ku) ṣait klyomai kātsane o(t) kakāmar kāmmai ci* "you were entered into the belly, oh noble one, then I have borne the bearing of you" (reading and translation according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

accented Sub V (and likewise kausativum) stems we have not so much to do with word initial accent but with mere accent retraction from the stem-final syllable onto the preceding syllable, because they could just bear accent due to a synchronic rule according to which the accent is to be placed onto the root. In other words, these forms do *not* prove that we have to do with a *process* of accent retraction.

18.2.4.   *Roots with basic root vowel (*)-ä- and persistent (*)-ā- in the Sub V*

There are roots that have a root vowel -*ä*- in the present stem, but persistent (*)-*ā*- as root vowel in the *ā*-subjunctive. All of these roots also form an *ā*-preterit stem of Subclass 5, which has exactly the same persistent (*)-*ā*- as root vowel (the preterit shows, of course, accentuation by the basic rule). The roots involved are the following:
nitt⁽ᵃ⁾- 'collapse' (itr) (a/-/a) (IoV/V/I), *päl*ᵃ- 'praise' (tr) (m/m/m) (VI/V/I), *pi*ᵃ- '± trumpet' (tr/itr) (a/a/a) (V/V/I), *pik*ᵃ- 'paint' (tr) (a+/m/x) (VII/V/I), *mänt*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'stir; destroy' (tr/itr) (x/x/a) (VI-XII/V/I), *miw*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'tremble' (itr) (x/-/x) (I-XII/V/I), *räk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'extend oneself' (itr) (-/m/-) (-/V/I), *lik*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'wash' (tr) (m/m/m) (VI/V/I), *lit*ᵃ- 'fall' (itr) (m/a/a) (IV/V/I), *lup*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'rub, smear' (tr) (m/a/x) (VIII/V/I), *skär*ᵃ- 'scold' (tr) (a+/a/x) (VI/V/I), *tsuk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'suck (out)' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/V/I).
Quite possibly, *kwäs*ᵃ- 'lament' (itr) (m/?/-) (VI/V/-) also belongs here, if the restored, contextless *kwāsoye(ntär)* is indeed an optative of this root. The only other relevant form is a derived adjective *kwasalñeṣṣa*, which would attest to a Sub V stem *kwäsā*-. *mān(t)s*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be sorrowful' (itr) (m/m/m) (II-VI/II-V/I) has introduced the *ā*-vowel into the Prs VI stem as well. *tsik*ᵃ- 'form' (tr) (-/a/m) (I/V/I) also belongs here, judging by the preterit. Note that *lit*ᵃ- 'fall' shows the expected Subclass 5 *ā*-preterit stem *laitā*- only in the PPt *lalaitau/ lalaitaṣ*, beside which there is a zero-grade *ā*-preterit stem attested by 3.sg.act. *lita* and the PPt *litau*. A quite similar distribution of TA *let*- and TA *lit*- is found in Tocharian A.[8]

---

[8] Adams, DoT, 502 supposes a similar paradigm for *yu*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'ripen', i.e., one with a 3.pl. Opt *yāwoṃ* (593 a 2) standing beside a zero-grade *ā*-preterit stem attested by PPt *ywauwa*.

18.2.5. *TB Sub V paradigms with ablaut*

The TB *ā*-subjunctives listed below had certainly or quite probably paradigmatic ablaut; for the corresponding TA forms with ablaut, see the list further below. Roots for which persistent initial accent in the Sub V is guaranteed are marked by an asterisk, roots that show initial accent and non-initial accent get two asterisks (if the accent is unclear I write a question mark):

*$kät^a$- 'strew' (tr) (x/x/x) (VI/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *kātaṃ*, 3.pl.mid. *katantar* (sic), 3.sg.mid. Opt *katoytär*, Ger II *(kata)lle*, Inf *katasi*; **$kätk^{(a)}$- 'cross', 'pass' (tr/itr) (x/x/a) (VI-VII-IXa/V/I) Sub V (tr/itr) 2.sg. *kātkat*, 3.sg. *katkaṃ* (MQ), 3.sg.mid. *kätkātär-me* (D), 3.sg.mid. Opt *kätkoytär-me* (Š), Ger II *katkalyi* (D), Abstr II *kätkālñe* (M)/*katkalñe* (S), Priv *ekätkātte* (MQ), Inf *katkatsi* (sic); **$kärs^{(a)}$- 'know, understand, recognize' (tr) (x/x/x) (VI/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *kārsau*, 2.sg. *kārsāt* (MQ), 3.sg. *kārsaṃ*, 3.sg.mid. *karsatär* (MQ), 1.sg. Opt *karsoym*, 3.sg. Opt *karsoy*, 3.pl. Opt *karsoṃ*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *kärsoytär* (M), Ger II *kärsālle* (MQ)/*kärsalyi* (sic), Abstr II *karsalñe* (sic), Inf *karsatsi* (sic); *$kärst^a$- 'cut off, destroy' (tr) (x/x/x) (VI/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *krāstäṃ* (sic), 1.sg. Opt *karstoym*, 2.sg. Opt *kärstoyt* (MQ), 1.sg.mid. Opt *karstoymar*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *karstoytär*, Abstr II *kärstalyñe* (MQ), Priv *eṅkärstātte* (MQ), Inf *karstatsi*; *$käl^a$- 'lead, bring' (tr) (x/x/x) (Xa/V/I) Sub V 2.sg. *kālat-neśco* (MQ), 3.sg. *kālaṃ*, 1.sg.mid. *kälamār* (MQ), 2.sg.mid. *kalatar*, 3.sg.mid. *kalatär*, 1.sg. Opt *kaloym*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *kaloytar* (sic), Ger II *kalalle*, Abstr II *kalalyñe* (MQ), Inf *kalatsi*; ʔ$käl(t)s^a$- 'pour, (op)press' (tr) (-/a/m) (VI/V/I) Sub V 2.sg. *klātsāt* (Š, sic); **$käsk^{(a)}$- 'scatter' (tr) (x/x/m) (XII/V/I) Sub V 2.sg. *kāskat*, 3.sg.mid. *käskātär*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *käskoytar* (sic), Abstr II *käskälläññe*; *$tärk^a$- 'dismiss, emit' (tr) (x/a/x) (VI/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *tārkau*, 3.sg. *tārkaṃ*, 1.pl. *tarkam*, 2.pl. *tarkacer*, 1.sg. Opt *tarkoym*, 2.sg. Opt *tärkoyt* (MQ), 3.sg. Opt *tarkoy*, 3.pl. Opt *tarko-ñ*, Ger II *tärkalye* (MQ)/*tarkallona*, Abstr II *tarkalyñe*, Inf *tarkatsi/tārkatsi*; ʔ$tuk^{(a)}$- 'hide oneself, seek refuge in' (itr) (m/a/-) (IIoIII/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *taukau-c*; ʔ$nätk^a$- 'hold distant, push away' (tr) (a/a/x) (VI-VII/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *nātkaṃ* (M); ʔnuk^a- 'swallow' (tr) (a/a/-) (VI/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *naukäṃn-ne* (MQ), 2.sg. Opt *nukoyt*; *$pänn^a$- 'stretch, pull (out, up)' (tr) (x/a/x) (II/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *pānnaṃ*, 1.sg. Opt *pannoym*, 3.sg. Opt *pannoy*, 3.pl. Opt *pannoṃ*, Inf *pannatsi*; ʔ$pärsk^{(a)}$- 'be afraid' (itr) (a/a/a) (V/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *prāskau*, 3.sg. *prāskaṃ*, Abstr II *pärskalñe* (MQ); *$pälk^a$- 'see, look at' (tr) (-/a/x) (-/V/I)[9] Sub V 1.sg. *pālkau*, 3.sg. *pālkaṃ*, 1.pl. *palkam*, Abstr II *palkalñe*, Priv *empalkaitte/ empālkatte* (MQ), Inf *palkatsi*; *$pälsk^a$- 'consider, think' (tr) (x/x/x) (VI/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *plāskau*, 3.sg. *plāskaṃ*, 1.sg. Opt *pälskoym* (MQ), 3.sg. Opt *pälskoy* (MQ), 3.sg.mid. Opt *palskoytär*, Abstr II *palskalyñe*, Inf *palskatsi*; *$putk^{(a)}$- 'divide, separate, distinguish' (tr) (x/a/x) (VII/V/I) Sub V 1.sg.

---

[9] There may be a middle Sub *plkāntär* (sic) attested in THT 1311 b 6, which would show syncope of the accented root vowel and accent shift to the suffix.

pautkau, 3.pl. *putkaṃ*, Abstr II *putkalñe*, Inf *putkatsi*; **märs^(ä)-* 'forget' (tr) (m/x/a) (III/V/I) Sub V 2.sg. *mārsat* (MQ), 1.sg. Opt *marsoym*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *marsoytär*, Inf *marsatsi* (MQ); **rutk^a-* '(re)move, take off, doff' (tr) (m/a/x) (VII/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *rautkaṃ*, Abstr II *rutkalyñe*, Inf *rutkatsi*; **läm^(ä)-* 'sit' (itr) (a/a/x) (V/V/I) Sub V 2.sg. *lāmat*, 3.sg. *lāmaṃ*, 1.pl. *lamam*, 3.pl. *lamaṃ*, 3.sg. Opt *lamoy*, Ger II *lamalle*, Abstr II *lamalñe*, Inf *lamatsi*; *ˀlu^a-* 'send' (tr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *lāwä<ṃ>*;[10] **sälk^a-* 'pull; show' (tr) (m/x/m) (VII/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *sālkaṃ*, 1.sg.mid. *salkamar*, 3.pl.mid. *sälkāntär* (MQ), 3.sg. Opt *salkoyne*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *sälkoytär* (MQ), Inf *salkatsi*; *ˀsik^a-* 'step, set foot' (itr) (a/a/-) (VI/V/-) Sub V 3.sg. *saikaṃ*; **stäm^(ä)-* 'stand' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *stāmaṃ*, 1.sg. Opt *stamoym*, 3.sg. Opt *stamoy*, 3.pl. Opt *stämoṃ* (MQ), Abstr II *stamalñe*, Inf *stamatsi*; **sruk^a-* 'die' (itr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *sraukau*, 3.sg. *sraukaṃ*, 3.sg. Opt *srūkoy*, Ger II *srukalle*, Abstr II *srukalñe*; ***tsänk^a-* '(a)rise' (itr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *tsänkau* (MQ), 3.sg. *tsānkaṃ*, 3.pl. *tsaṅkaṃ*, 3.sg. Opt *tsaṅkoy*, 3.pl. Opt *tsäṅkon-me* (sic), Ger II *tsaṅkalyana*, Abstr II *tsaṅkalñe*, Inf *tsaṅkatsi*.

Note the strange schwebeablaut in the roots *kärst^a-*, *käl(t)s^a-*, and *pälsk^a-*.

Some TB roots have paradigms with root initial accent, for which no active singular subjunctive forms are attested. I think that the following cases can quite safely be assigned to the ablauting group on account of the TA equivalents, which do show ablaut: *klänts^(ä)-* 'sleep', *mälk^(ä)-* '± put (on) (jewelry, weapons)', *yuk^(ä)-* 'overcome', see below 18.2.6., and cf. Eyþórsson, 1993, 55f. On the other hand, I do not think *trik^(ä)-* 'go astray' also belongs here despite the 3.sg.act. TA *trekaṣ*.[11]

The following TB roots probably formed similar paradigms, to judge from the evidence of non-finite forms with initial accent, although active singular subjunctive forms are neither attested in Tocharian B nor in Tocharian A:

kärk^a- 'rob' (for the Inf *kärkatsi* see below), *klutk^(ä)-* 'turn, become' (Inf *klutkatsi*), *märtk^a-* 'shave (the head)' (Inf *markasi*, sic), *mit^(ä)-* 'set out' (Inf *mītatsy*; on the alleged 3.sg. *maitaṃ*, see s.v. *mit^(ä)-*), *yäks^a-* 'entangle' (Inf *yaksatsi*), *räṅk^(ä)-* 'ascend' (Inf *raṅkatsi*), *räss^(ä)-* 'tear, pick' (Abstr *rassalñe*), *luk^(ä)-* 'light up' (Inf *lukatsi*), *wät^(a?)-* 'fight' (Abstr *watalyñe*).

---

[10] Sic! Not *lāwaṃ* as per WTG, 284, see the discussion above 18.2.1.

[11] The TB Priv *atraikatte* seems to attest to the same ablaut grade, but since the privative is normally based on the weak stem allomorph of an ablauting paradigm, and since *trik^(ä)-* is further a Prs III verb, no singular active forms (actually the only forms which would show *traik-* within an ablauting paradigm) would be expected for Tocharian B in any case (see the discussion in chap. Prs III/IV 26.2.3. and Prs/Sub IX 31.2.).

The following three roots evidently had middle-only paradigms with invariable word-initial accent: *mäk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'run' (Inf *makatsi*), *ritᵃ*- 'seek' (Inf *rītatsi*), *wärpᵃ*- 'feel; enjoy' (Inf *warpatsi*).

The root *nu⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'cry' is a special case. It has persistent initial accent in the Sub V, but no æ-grade in the singular active, to judge from the newly attested 3.sg.act. *nuwaṃ*: *nu⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'cry' (tr) (m/x/m) (III/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *nuwaṃ*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *nuwoytär*, Abstr II *nūwalñe/nwalñe*. I propose that *nuwaṃ* may just be an analogical form that was built on the model of frequent *śuwaṃ*.

18.2.6.   *TA Sub V paradigms with ablaut*

ᴬ*kätk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'cross, pass' (tr/itr) (x/a/a) (VII/V/I) Sub V (tr/itr) 2.sg. *katkat*, 3.sg. *katkaṣ*, 2.pl. *kätkāc*, 3.pl. *kätkeñc*, Ger II *kätkāl*, Abstr II *kätkālune*; ᴬ*kälkᵃ*- 'go' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *kalkam*, 2.sg. *kalkat*, 3.sg. *kalkaṣ*, 1.pl. *kälkāmäs*, 2.pl. *kälkāc*, 3.pl. *kälkeñc*, 1.sg. Opt *kälkim*, 2.sg. Opt *kälkit*, 3.sg. Opt *kälkiṣ*, Ger II *kälkāl*, Abstr II *kälkālune*; ᴬ*kärs⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'know, understand, recognize' (tr) (x/x/x) (VI/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *krasaṣ*, 3.pl. *kärseñc*, 3.sg.mid. *kärsātär*, 2.pl.mid. *kärsācär*, 1.pl. Opt *kärsimäs*, 3.pl. Opt *kärsiñc*, Ger II *kärsāl*, Abstr II *kärsālune*; ᴬ*kälᵃ*- 'lead, bring' (tr) (x/x/x) (VI/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *kalam*, 3.pl. *kleñc*, 1.sg.mid. *klāmār*, 2.sg.mid. *klātār*, 3.sg.mid. *klātār*, 2.pl.mid. *klācär*, 3.sg. Opt *kliṣ*, 2.sg.mid. Opt *klitār*, Ger II *klāl*, Abstr II *klālune*; ᴬ*klis*- 'sleep' (itr) (a/a/a) (VI/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *klesaṣ*, 3.sg. Opt *klisiṣ*; ᴬ*tärkᵃ*- 'dismiss, emit' (tr) (x/a/a) (VI/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *tarkam*, 3.sg. *tarkaṣ*, 2.pl. *tärkāc*, 3.pl. *tärkeñc*, Ger II *tärkāl*, Abstr II *tärkālune*; ᴬ*trik⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be confused; faint' (itr) (m+/a/a) (III/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *trekaṣ*; ᴬ*putkᵃ*- 'divide, distinguish' (tr) (x/a/a) (VII/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *potkam*, Abstr II *putkālune*; ᴬ*prutk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be shut; be filled' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *protkaṣ*, Abstr II *prutkālune*; ᴬ*mälkᵃ*- 'put together' (tr) (-/a/m) (VII/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *malkam*; ᴬ*mluskᵃ*- 'escape' (itr) (m/a/-) (III/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *mloskam*, 3.pl. Opt *mluskiñc*; ᴬ*yukᵃ*- 'overcome, conquer' (tr) (a/a/-) (VI/V/I) Sub V 2.sg. *yokat*; ᴬ*räsᵃ*- 'stretch (out)' (tr) (a/a/-) (VI/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *rasaṣ*; ᴬ*läm⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'sit' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *lamam*, 3.sg. *lamaṣ*, 1.sg. Opt *lmim*, Ger II *lmālyāṃ*, Abstr II *lmālune*; ᴬ*luᵃ*- 'send' (tr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *lawam*, 2.sg. *lawat*, Ger II *lwāl*; ᴬ*wik⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'disappear' (itr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *wekaṣ*, Abstr II *wikālune*; ᴬ*ṣtäm⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'stand' (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *ṣtamaṣ*, 3.pl. Opt *ṣtmiñc*, Ger II *ṣtmāl*, Abstr II *ṣtmālune*; ᴬ*sik⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be overflown' (itr) (m/a/-) (III/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *sekaṣ*; ᴬ*tsälp⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'pass away, be released' (itr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *tsalpaṣ*, 2.pl. *tsälpāc*, 3.pl. *tsälpeñc*, 3.sg. Opt *tsälpi*, 1.pl. Opt *tsälpimäs*, 3.pl. Opt *tsälpiñc*, Abstr II *tsälpālune*; ᴬ*tsukᵃ*- 'drink' (tr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *tsokam*.

The following TA roots are also best assigned to the ablauting class, but only on account of the ablaut attested in Tocharian B, since in Tocharian A no active singular forms are attested: ^A*kärṣt^ä*- 'cut off', ^A*pärsk^(ä)*- 'be afraid', ^A*pälk^ä*- 'see', ^A*päl(t)sk^ä*- 'think', ^A*märs^ä*- 'forget', ^A*rutk^ä*- '(re)move', and probably ^A*yäks^ä*- 'entangle', for which in Tocharian B we may assume persistent initial accent, although no active singular is attested.

18.2.7.   *The tsä́mā-/tsämä́- type*

Based on the subjunctive forms listed in the manuals for *tsäm^(ä)*- 'grow' (WTG, 307, etc.), i.e., 2.sg.act. *tsāmat* vs. 3.pl.mid. *tsmāntär*, Adams, 1988a, 103, fn. 54 set up the accent/ablaut type *tsä́mā-/tsämä́-*, which W. Winter, apud Adams thought to "reflect two paradigms". Differently, Eyþórsson, 1993, esp. 58ff. took precisely this paradigm as a relic one and as proof of his theory that the whole class once had mobile accent in Proto-Tocharian. However, pace Eyþórsson, the existence of that 2.sg. *tsāmat* is philologically problematic, see the discussion s.v. *tsäm^(ä)*- 'grow'. On the other hand, there is indeed one root showing ablaut and initial accent on the æ-grade singular active allomorph, but non-initial accent in the forms containing the zero-grade allomorph: *käsk^(ä)*- 'scatter' with 2.sg.act. *kāskat* 'you will scatter'[12] vs. 3.sg.mid. *käskātär*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *käskoytar* (sic) and Abstr *käskalläññe.*

18.2.8.   *TB Sub V paradigms with persistent (*)-ä- as root vowel and lack of word-initial accent*

18.2.8.1. *Paradigms with active forms*

The following roots show a TB Sub V paradigm with persistent (*)-*ä*- as root vowel, lack of word-initial accent, and active forms:

tätt^ä- act. 'put, set, place', mid. 'place oneself' (tr) (-/x/-) (-/V/I) (not in TA) Sub V 3.sg. *tattaṃ*, 3.pl. *tattaṃ*, 3.sg.mid. *tättātär*, 3.pl.mid. *tättāntär*, 3.pl. Opt *täcciyeṃ-ne*, 1.pl.mid. Opt *taccimar* (sic),[13] Abstr II *tättālñe/t_ättālñe*, Inf

---

[12] Attested in H 150.122 b 4. The text does not show MQ character.

[13] Strictly speaking, this one form from the Sub V stem of *tätt^ä*- does show word-initial accent, but does so, most probably just in its capacity as an optative; see my discussion on imperfect forms (from former optatives) that also show irregular word-initial accent in chap. Imp 15.2.

tättātsi-śc; *pärk^a-* '(a)rise, become clear' (itr) (-/x/a) (-/V/I) (not in TA) Sub V
3.pl. *pärkaṃ-me* (sic), 3.sg.mid. *pärkātär*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *pärkoytär-ñ*, Abstr II
pärkālñe; *mäṅk^(a)-* 'be inferior, lack' (itr) (m/x/a) (III/V/I) (= med. tant. TA Sub
V) Sub V 1.pl. *mäṅkāmo* (MQ), 3.sg.mid. *mäṅkātär*, 3.pl.mid. *mäṅkāntär*,
Abstr II *mäṅkālñe*; *räm^a-* 'bend, bow' (itr) (a/x/m) (VI/V/I) (not in TA) Sub V
3.pl.mid. *rmantär* (MQ), 3.pl. Opt *ramoṃ*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *rmoytär*; *läk^(a)-* 'see,
look' (tr) (x/x/x) (IXa-V/V/I) (usually suppleted in TA) Sub V 1.sg. *lakau*, 2.sg.
lkāt, 3.sg. *lakaṃ*, 1.pl. *lkām-c*, 2.pl. *lkācer*, 3.pl. *lakaṃ*, 3.sg.mid. *lkātär*,
3.pl.mid. *lkāntär*, 1.sg. Opt *lkoym*, 3.sg. Opt *lakoy*, 2.pl. Opt *lkoycer*, 3.pl. Opt
lkoyeṃ, 3.pl.mid. Opt *lkoyentär*, Ger II *lkālye*, Abstr II *lkālyñe*, Inf *lkātsi*;
wätk^(a)- 'decide, differ' (itr) (-/x/a) (-/V/I)[14] Sub V 2.sg. Opt *wätkoyt*, 1.pl.mid.
Opt *wätkomtär*, Ger II in *wätkālyce*, Abstr II *watkālñe* (sic); *śuw^a-* 'eat,
consume' (tr) (x/a/x) (V/V/I) (only non-finite Sub V in TA) Sub V 1.sg. *śū*,
3.sg. *śuwaṃ/śūwaṃ*, 3.pl. *śuwaṃ/śwā-ñ*, 3.sg. Opt *śuwoy*, Ger II *śwālle*, Priv
eśuwacca, Inf *śwātsi*.

18.2.8.2. *Media tantum*

The following roots show a TB Sub V paradigm with persistent (*)-*ä*-
as root vowel, lack of word-initial accent, and a middle-only
inflection:

kärr^a- 'scold' (tr) (m/m/m) (V/V/I), *kul^a-* 'recede' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I), *tin^a-* '±
defile oneself' (?) (a/m/-) (IX/V/?), *triw^(a)-* 'be mixed, shaken' (itr) (m/m/a)
(III/V/I), *prutk^(a)-* 'be shut; be filled' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I+III), *mätsts^a-* 'starve'
(itr) (m/m/-) (III/V/I), *mlutk^a-* 'escape' (itr) (m/m/-) (III/V/-), *ritt^(a)-* 'be
attached, persist, be suitable' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I), *lip^a-* 'remain, be left over'
(itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I), *wik^(a)-* 'disappear' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I), *spänt^(a)-* 'trust'
(itr) (m/m/-) (III/V/I), *spärk^(a)-* 'disappear, perish' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I),
tsäm^(a)- 'grow, increase, come into being' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I), *tsälp^(a)-* 'pass
away' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I).

In the following cases of roots with persistent root vowel (*)-*ä*- and
non-initial accent only non-finite forms are attested in the Sub V:

kälsk^a- 'set, disappear' (?) (−) (-/V/-), *krämp^(a)-* 'be hindered' (itr) (m/-/a)
(III/V/I), *trik^(a)-* 'go astray, be confused' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I), *truk^a-* '± give,
portion' (tr) (−) (VI/V/-), *pälw^a-* 'lament' (tr/itr) (a+/-/a) (V/V/I), *pläṅk^(a)-*
'come up for sale' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I), *musk^(a)-* 'disappear, perish' (itr)
(m/-/a) (III/V/I), *mlut^a-* '± pluck' (?) (−) (IXa/V/-), *sätk^(a)-* 'spread out' (itr)
(m/-/a) (III/V/I), *siy^a-* 'sweat' (itr) (m/-/-) (III/V/I), *tsär^(a)-* 'be separated' (itr)
(m/-/a) (III/V/I).

---

[14] The TA stem is a problem, see below fn. 17; note that it is not excluded
that *wätkoyt* may be restored to a middle form, see s.v. *wätk^(a)-*.

18.2.9.   *TA Sub V paradigms with persistent (*)-ä- as root vowel*

Twelve TA roots have finite forms from the Sub V stem showing as root vowel (*)-*ä*- only, and in all but one case (*^Asäk^ä*- '± follow') only forms from outside the active singular are attested; this can, of course, in some instances just be due to accident, and hence these may in theory belong to the ablauting class (and in the cases of *^Akärṣt^ä*- 'cut off', *^Apärsk^(a)*- 'be afraid', *^Apälk^ä*- 'see',[15] *^Apäl(t)sk^ä*- 'think', *^Amärs^ä*- 'forget', *^Arutk^ä*- '(re)move', and probably *^Ayäks^ä*- 'entangle' this can indeed safely be assumed on the account of the TB cognate):

^Akälp^(a)- 'obtain' (tr) (m/m/m) (VI/V/I) (~ TB Sub VI, act. tant.) Sub V 1.sg.mid. *kälpāmār*, 2.sg.mid. *kälpātär*, 3.sg.mid. *kälpātär*, 1.pl.mid. *kälpāmtär*, 2.pl.mid. *kälpācär*, 1.sg.mid. Opt *kälpimār*, 2.sg.mid. Opt *kälpitār*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *kälpitär*, 1.pl.mid. Opt *kälpimtär*, 3.pl.mid. Opt *kälpintär*, Ger II *kälpāl*, Abstr II *kälpālune*; *^Akul^ä*- 'recede' (itr) (m/a/-) (III/V/-) (= TB Sub V, non-initial accent, med. tant.) Sub V 3.sg. Opt *kuliṣ*, Abstr II *k̬lālune*; *^Atriw^(a)*- 'be mixed' (itr) (m/a/-) (III/V/I) (= TB Sub V, non-initial accent, med. tant.) Sub V 3.pl. *triweñc*; *^Anut^(a)*- 'disappear' (itr) (-/m/-) (-/V/I) (~ *naut^(a)*- Sub V with persistent -*au*-, initial accent, act. tant.) Sub V 3.sg.mid. *nutātär*; *^Apälk^ä*- 'see' (tr) (-/m/m) (-/V/I) (= TB Sub V, ablauting, act. tant.) Sub V 1.sg.mid. *pälkāmār*, 2.sg.mid. *pälkātär*, 3.sg.mid. *pälkātär*, 3.pl.mid. *pälkāntär*, 2.sg.mid. Opt *pälkītār*, Ger II *pälkāl*, Abstr II *pälkālune*; *^Arit^ä*- 'seek' (tr) (m+/m/m) (VI/V/I) (= TB Sub V, initial accent (!), med. tant.) Sub V 1.sg.mid. *ritāmār*, 1.pl.mid. *ritāmtär*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *rititär*, Abstr II *ritālune*; *^Awärp^ä*- 'feel, etc.' (tr) (m+/m/m) (VI/V/I) (= TB Sub V, initial accent (!), med. tant.) Sub V 3.sg.mid. *wärpātär*, 3.pl.mid. *wärpāṃtär*, 2.sg.mid. Opt *wärpitär-ñi*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *wärpitär*, 3.pl.mid. Opt *wärpintär*, Ger II *wärpāl*, Abstr II *wärpālune*; *^Asäk^ä*- '± follow' (?) (-/a/m) (VI/V/I) (not attested in TB) Sub V 3.sg. *skāṣ*; *^Asälp^ä*- 'glow' (itr) (a/a/-) (I/V/I) (TB Sub class is unclear: Ger II *sälpallentse* (Š), Inf *sälpatsi*) Sub V 3.sg. Opt *sälpiṣ*, Ger II *sälpāly*; *^Atsäk^(a)*- 'pull, take (out, away)' (tr) (x/m/x) (VI/V/I) (not attested in TB) Sub V 1.sg.mid. *tskāmār*, 2.sg.mid. Opt *tskitār*, Ger II *tskāl*, Abstr II *tskālune*; *^Atsär^(a)*- 'be separated' (itr) (-/m/a) (III/V/I) (= TB Sub V, non-initial accent, only non-finite forms) Sub V 3.sg.mid. *tsratär* (sic), Abstr II *tsrālune*; *^Atsit^(a)*- 'touch' (tr) (a/a/a) (VI/V/I) (Sub not attested in TB) Sub V 1.sg. Opt *tsitim*, Abstr II *tsitālune*.

In the following cases only non-finite forms are attested in Tocharian A, and no diagnostic TB cognates survive:

^Akrämp^ä- 'be hindered' (itr) (—) (-/V/I) (non-initial accent, only non-fin. in TB), *^Atäk^ä*- 'touch' (tr) (a/-/-) (IoII/V/-) (Sub I in TB), *^Atäkw^ä*- '?' (—) (V/V/-)

---

[15] But note that this root has a medium tantum Sub V in TA, whereas TB shows an ablauting activum tantum Sub V; see chap. Voice 5.2.2.2.

(not attested in TB), *A*tä̆l⁽ᵃ⁾- 'lift up' (tr) (—) (-/V/-) (Sub V or VI in TB), *A*triw⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be mixed' (itr) (m/a/-) (II/V/I) (non-initial accent, med. tant. in TB), *A*näm⁽ᵃ⁾- 'bow' (Sub I + III in TB), *A*musk*ᵃ*- 'disappear' (non-initial accent, only non-fin. in TB), *A*yu⁽ᵃ⁾- 'turn' (Gv. not attested in TB), *A*yutk*ᵃ*- 'be worried' (not attested in TB), *A*lä̆k⁽ᵃ⁾- 'see' (tr) (x/-/-) (V/V/-) (Sub normally suppleted by *A*pälk*ᵃ*-), *A*litk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'remove' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/V/I) (TB only Kaus.), *A*ly*ᵃ*- 'sweep' (tr) (x/-/-) (VIII/V/-) (Sub not attested in TB), *A*wänt*ᵃ*- 'cover' (?) (—) (-/V/I) (Sub not attested in TB), *A*wäm*ᵃ*- '± set' (?) (—) (-/V/-) (not attested in TB), *A*śuw*ᵃ*- 'eat' (tr) (a+/-/-) (V/V/-) (non-initial accent, act. tant. in TB), *A*sum*ᵃ*- 'take away' (tr) (m+/-/-) (VI/V/-) (~ sāmp⁽ᵃ⁾-), *A*sätk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'spread out' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) (non-initial accent, only non-fin. in TB), *A*spänt*ᵃ*- 'trust' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) (non-initial accent, med. tant. in TB), *A*spärk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'disappear' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/V/I) (non-initial accent, med. tant. in TB), *A*tsäm⁽ᵃ⁾- 'grow' (itr) (m/-/-) (III/V/I) (non-initial accent, med. tant. in TB).

18.2.10.   Umlaut and vowel balance in Tocharian A

The root vowel TA -*a*- showing up in the active singular of subjunctive paradigms made from ablauting Sub V stems shows that the root has not been subject to *ā*-umlaut, cf., e.g., 3.sg. TA *katkaṣ* < **katkāṣ* (vowel balance) < PT **kætkāṣ* from *A*kätk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'cross'.

   *A*eṃts⁽ᵃ⁾- 'seize' is the only root from which *ā*-subjunctive forms without expected weakening by vowel balance are attested (beside forms that do show such weakening), and the reason for this behavior is undoubtedly that the TA root is a secondary creation based on a reanalysis of an old Pt III (see s.v. *A*eṃts⁽ᵃ⁾- 'seize'): e.g., 1.sg.mid. TA *e(ṃ)tsāmār*[16] beside regularly weakened 1.sg.mid. TA *eṃtsmār*. All other finite forms of the subjunctive stem of that root show weakening by vowel balance, while all non-finite subjunctive stem formations do not show it.[17]

---

[16] A 404 b 5, TG, 425 "im Verse". Although there is not much left of the fragment, a verbal form of such kind standing in sentence-final position is highly likely: //// e(ṃ)tsāmār : 3 ||.

[17] At first glance, there even seems to be one other form of the TA *e(ṃ)tsāmār* kind, i.e., TA *watkāṣ-äṃ* in A 410 a 2, which was analyzed as 3.sg.act. Sub V of *A*wätk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'separate' by TG, 469 by an emendation to TA *watkas-äm*. However, in my opinion, we are just dealing with omission of the *ä*-dots, i.e., a regular and otherwise attested Sub IX form *wätkāṣ-äm*; note that the following form in the line TA *ysamo* also has to be corrected, scil. to *ysomo* 'on the whole'.

18.2.11.   *Irregular forms in ablauting Sub V paradigms*

Apart from the *käsk*⁽ᵃ⁾- forms already listed above 18.2.7., the Sub V of *kätk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'cross' shows different accent variants: non-initial accent in the 3.sg.mid. *kätkātär-me* in THT 3596 b 2 (D) (differently read by Tamai, 2007a, s.v.), in the 3.sg.mid. Opt *kätkoytär-me* in 11 a 4 (Š), and in the Abstr *kätkalñe* in 418 a 2 (M); on the other hand, an Abstr *katkalñe* with initial accent is found in the eastern text THT 1419 frg. f a 3 (S); similarly, the Inf *katkatsi* is attested thus at least six times: 355 b 4 (M); 608 a 2 (M); IOL Toch 387 a 2; THT 1397 frg. j a 2; THT 1403 frg. c a 3 (S); THT 2585 a 2.[18] Accent variants are also attested for: Inf *kärkatsi* (Š) beside *karkatsi* (Š) from *kärk*ᵃ- 'rob';[19] 3.sg. Opt *kärsoytär* (M) and Ger *kärsalyi* (sic, most likely for *kärsālyî*) from *kärs*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'know'; 3.pl.mid. Opt *wärpoyentär* (S) from *wärp*ᵃ- 'feel'; and 3.pl. Opt *tsäṅkon-me* (sic) from *tsäṅk*ᵃ- '(a)rise'.

The variation of Inf *tārkatsi* (21 a 5, Š) and *tarkatsi* (attested more often) from *tärk*ᵃ- 'dismiss' is yet another kind of irregularity, because both show initial accent, *tarkatsi* being the regular form (*tárkātsî*) and *tārkatsi* showing an unexpected root vowel -*ā*-.[20] As for the Ger II *sparkālye* (88 a 5, Š) attested beside expected *spärkālñe* from *spärk*ᵃ- 'disappear', this is reminiscent of forms with root vowel *-*ā*- attested in the *ā*-preterit from this root as well (3.sg. *sparkā-ne* 99 a 1, Š, the only attested finite Pt I form); if we do not simply have to do with writing errors (an assumption that would require three misspellings and is hence not to be preferred), *sparkālye* may be analogical to the Pt I; see my discussion in chap. Pt I 7.1.3.5.

There are then just a few forms with non-initial accent where one might expect initial accent, and even fewer *æ*-grade forms from ablauting paradigms for which one might expect zero grade. What

---

[18] I owe these attestations to M. Peyrot (p.c.).

[19] To be sure, the Inf *kärkatsi* attested beside regular *karkatsi* in the same text is most likely a mere error, because without initial accent one should have expected †*kärkātsi*. Since the graphemes ⟨ka⟩ and ⟨ka⟩ cannot be confused easily, I suspect that the text may have been copied from an older version with MQ character, where *kärkatsi* would have been the normal writing.

[20] The Priv *empālkatte* (if this is indeed to be derived from *pälk*ᵃ- 'see' at all, see s.v. *pälk*ᵃ- 'see') may be attested in an MQ text with old ductus (281, see in general Malzahn, 2007a, 255ff., the text has by mistake been omitted from the list p. 264), but since the manuscript shows many misspellings, the form has no linguistic value (thus also Hilmarsson, 1991, 71), and hence does not attest to a former *æ*-grade.

seems not attested at all at least in Tocharian B is an irregular zero-grade where one might expect æ-grade.[21] As for Tocharian A, it is unclear to me whether the hapax 3.sg.act. TA *skāṣ-äṃ* from *ᴬsäk*ᵃ*-* '± follow' (not attested in TB) belongs to a paradigm that did not have root ablaut right from the start, or rather attests to sporadic paradigmatic leveling within originally ablauting paradigms of Tocharian A.[22]

18.3.   THE FUNCTION OF SUBJUNCTIVE CLASSES I AND V

Although it must have become clear that many of the subjunctives of Class I and V are morphologically parallel from a synchronic point of view, both classes differ with respect to function: Class V subjunctives serve with two exceptions (1.sg. *kyānamar*, which belongs to a Pt II, and Inf *mrauskatsi*, for which see below 18.3.2.) as subjunctive stems for grundverbs only. In contrast, subjunctive stems of Class I can belong to a grundverb paradigm, but also to an antigrundverb paradigm in both languages, as is evidenced by the following cases: *ār*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Antigv. 'leave, abandon', *āl*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Antigv. 'keep away', *räk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Antigv. 'cover', *ränk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Antigv. 'ascend', *länk-* Antigv. act. 'hang up', *wätk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Antigv. 'separate, decide, command' (Sub I + II), *ᴬspärk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Antigv. 'get lost' (itr!), *tsuk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Antigv. '± suckle; foster' (note that both grundverb and antigrundverb are transitive!). In the antigrundverb function, the Class I subjunctive competes with the thematic Class II subjunctive, but note that the Sub I can easily be thematized. Note also that a Class I subjunctive can stand as transitive subjunctive stem beside a respective intransitive subjunctive of Class III (in the case of *kän*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'fulfill, come about, occur', *käs-* 'extinguish, come to extinction', *ᴬᴮnäk-* 'destroy, lose, fall into ruin', *näm-* 'bend, bow', *tsäk-* 'burn (tr/itr)').

---

[21] The 3.sg.act. *tsaṅkaṃ* instead of *tsāṅkaṃ* can be regarded as a mere blunder, because it is just the *ā*-stroke that is absent.

[22] Cf. the 3.sg.act. form TA *spärksā-m* with non-palatalizing *-ä-*. The purely phonological explanation given for TA *skāṣ-äṃ* in TEB 47, § 11,4 is hardly credible, because in TA, full vowels standing in a first syllable never show weakening otherwise.

18.3.1. *kyānamar*

kyānamar (S) is a subjunctive form[23] with a stem ending in PT *-ā-, but a quite exceptional one, because it belongs semantically to a Kausativum I paradigm, scil. of *kän*[(a)]*-* Kaus I 'fulfill (a wish)', together with a Class IXb present and a Class II preterit, so that one should have expected here a Class IXb subjunctive (which may be even attested by the Ger *känäṣäle*), and not one of Class V. According to Peters, forthc., the Pt II *kyānā-* itself seems to be reshaped from an earlier *kānā-* that may still be attested by the 3.pl. active form *kānare*. To judge from this completely irregular form and the irregular Sub V, Pt II *kyānā-* may have started out as a Pt I *kānā-*,[24] but this Pt I must still have been a quite irregular formation itself, with respect to both its persistent word-initial accent and its function as oppositional transitive of *kän*[(a)]*-* 'come about, occur'. Diachronically, however, that Pt I can, according to Peters, be accounted for. The PPt *kekenu* in all probability presupposes the existence of a pre-PT active perfect stem allomorph *ke-kon-; on the other hand, the PIE root involved certainly was the seṭ root *√ĝenh$_1$, and this had formed a PIE full-grade middle root aorist *ĝenh$_1$-to, which may have triggered the formation (via what I call the *tēzzi* principle) of a present > subjunctive stem pre-PT

---

[23] Although the context of *kyānamar* in 401 b 4 is quite fragmentary, this is still the best analysis from a philological point of view, see Peyrot, 2008, 157f. In addition, Peyrot cogently restores *kamts(·)–r* in line b 3 of the same text to *kamts(ama)r*, i.e., a form of the middle Pt III of *käm-* 'come' with a 1.sg. ending of the present/subjunctive system, and hence a formation parallel to *kyānamar*. Peyrot toys with the idea that both forms are secondary creations of the informal/eastern variety (or later language, as is preferred by Peyrot) and that they are based on the respective preterits, because in the case of *käm-* the subjunctive stem *śäm-/śämn-* was irregular, while the Sub IXb of *kän*[(a)]*-* would have been "homophonous with the present". While the first claim is undoubtedly true, all other roots showing the highly productive pattern Prs/Sub IXb, Pt II did not have problems with the homophony of Prs and Sub. As will be argued in the main text, there are reasons to believe that *kyānamar* may be based on a inherited form, and is not a purely arbitrary formation. As for *kamts(ama)r*, I think that as soon as the TB speakers of that variety had the subjunctive stem *kyānā-* in use, i.e., a seemingly preterit stem plus subjunctive endings, they could have created a similar Sub *kamts(ama)r* analogically.

[24] Additional evidence comes from TA, where the Pt II made from [A]*kän-* also behaves irregularly, scil. with respect to the imperative formation, because instead of a Class II imperative, we have a 2.sg. active form TA *pkanā-ñi*, which descriptively has to be assigned to Class III or even to Class I.

*ke/äna- > PT *känā- (with *kä- as result of another analogical reshaping),[25] which actually seems to be presupposed by both the TB optative forms *käñiyoytär* and *kñyoytar* and the TA optative *knitär* lacking palatalization. Under the influence of that *käna-, the former perfect stem pre-PT *kekon- may have been reshaped into *kekona- before the general morphologically conditioned loss of reduplication syllables in the members of preterit Class III that were the outcomes of former perfect forms had occurred (see for this assumption chap. Pt III), and *kekona- by all means should, or at least could have turned into initially accented *kānā-*.[26]

18.3.2.   *mrauskatsi*

The Inf *mrauskatsi* from *mrausk[(a)]- 'feel disgust' is remarkable, because in its only occurrence is used transitively: 5 a 7 *l(ā)nte palsko mrauskatsiś* "um den Geist des Königs von der Welt abzuwenden" (TochSprR(B), transl., 10; Thomas, 1954, 752, fn. 258; [2]TochSprR(B), 148). According to Thomas, 1954, 712, it is indeed possible for infinitives from intransitive grundverbs to have transitive valency. However, apart from *mrauskatsi*, I see no reason to accept any of his examples; see the discussion in chap. Valency 4.10.2.

Accordingly, it is tempting to assume that also the finite forms belonging to the middle Sub V stem *mrauskā- could be used both intransitively and transitively, i.e., that this stem could function as its own causative and anticausative at the same time. Accordingly, the finite forms built from the Sub V stem *mrauskā- that had anticausative semantics underwent a secondary accent shift onto the right in order to become formally distinct from the transitively used forms, which is quite reminiscent of the general claim made by

---

[25] The source for *kän- may have been a middle perfect PIE *ĝe-ĝṇh₁-toi̯ (cf. Greek γεγένημαι, a blend of *gegnē- with aoristic γενε-), a proto-form which should have resulted precisely in pre-PT *käkän-t° > *kän-t°, and may underlie Sub III *knetär*, TA *knatär* and also the form *kantär*.

[26] At a first glance, it may look strange that pre-PT *ke-kona- escaped dereduplication, especially with regard to the fact that it may have been the only pre-PT preterit stem ending in *-a- that derived from an active perfect and therefore was provided with a reduplication syllable, if the Pt I stem PT *tākā- had rather started out as a Pt III stem PT *tāk-. But the reduplication syllable may have been preserved in pre-PT *ke-kona- precisely because it would have been the only input for a morphological dereduplication process among the Class I preterits.

Marggraf, 1970, 31 that among the middle forms of Sub V "hat sich ...
eine formale Kennzeichnung einer Opposition *transitiv* (unmarkiert) :
intransitiv / passiv (markiert durch Suffixbetonung) herausgebildet".

18.4. MORPHOLOGICAL PATTERNING

18.4.1.   *The corresponding preterit stems*

Most Class I subjunctive stems are associated with *s*-preterits. The
exception *yām-* 'do' with Pt IV is certainly secondary, and the same
seems to be true for *tränk-* 'lament', where the *ā*-preterit with root-
final palatalization seems to be formed to the secondary thematic
subjunctive stem. Whether *yok-* 'drink' has a thematic preterit, is very
uncertain. Beside the few TA Class I subjunctives only *s*-preterits are
attested, and one should note that most of the Class VII subjunctives,
which replaced Class I subjunctives in Tocharian A, also stand beside
s-preterits.

On the other hand, almost all Class V subjunctives are associated
with *ā*-preterits, as pointed out, e.g., by Lane, 1959, 170. As for possible
exceptions, Lane discusses first *tin^ä-* '± defile oneself' with *tettinor*
pointing to the existence of a PPt **tettinu*, which he says "would
probably belong to an *s*-preterit", although he also compares the PPt
lyelyku made to the *ā*-preterit stem *lyākā-*. This is not appropriate,
however, because *lyākā-*/ PPt *lyelyku* show a completely different
kind of ablaut. Accordingly, *tettinor* seems indeed to belong to an *s*-
preterit, although one should rather assume that the Pt III itself
belonged to an (otherwise unattested) antigrundverb paradigm made
from the root. As a second exception, Lane mentions the 3.sg. Pt II
kyāna beside Sub V *kyānamar* from *kän^(ä)-*, for which see above. On *s*-
preterit-like forms found in what are basically Pt I paradigms such as
that of *prutk^(ä)-* 'be shut, filled', see chap. Pt I 7.2.1.1. A clear example
of an irregular preterit stem is found with *mit^(ä)-* 'set out, go, come',
where a Sub V and a present of Class III stands beside an *s*-preterit
stem.

Comparing *ā*-subjunctives with corresponding *ā*-preterits leads to
the following result: all roots forming a Subclass 1 or a Subclass 4 *ā*-
preterit, i.e., those showing palatalizing (*)-*ä*- as root vowel in the
singular active and thereby assumed to derive from PIE root aorists
built from seṭ roots, always have a corresponding *ā*-subjunctive with

ablaut in both Tocharian A and B, and initial accent in Tocharian B. There is no exception to this rule:[27]

kät^a- 'strew', *kätk$^{(a)}$-/^{A}kätk$^{(a)}$-* 'cross, pass', *kärs$^{(a)}$-/^{A}kärs$^{(a)}$-* 'know', *käl^a-/^{A}käl^a-* 'lead, bring', *klänts$^{(a)}$-/^{A}klis^a-* 'sleep', *tärk^a-/^{A}tärk^a-* 'dismiss, emit', *läm$^{(a)}$-/^{A}läm$^{(a)}$-* 'sit', *^{AB}lu^a-* 'send', *stäm$^{(a)}$-/^{A}ṣtäm$^{(a)}$-* 'stand'.

^{A}tsuk^a- 'drink' may have a Subclass 4 *ā*-preterit, but its TB equivalent has a Subclass 5 *ā*-preterit, which is then fully in line with the non-ablauting Sub V having persistent (*)ā as root vowel.

On the other hand, the roots having a Subclass 2 or a Subclass 3 *ā*-preterit, i.e., those clearly showing a pre-PT *ä and not a pre-PT *e as root vowel in the singular active, for the most part have middle-only Sub V in Tocharian B, which neither shows initial accent nor ablaut. The only notable exception is *kärst^a-* 'cut off', which forms an ablauting Sub V with initial accent (full-grade 3.sg.act. *krāstäṃ*; on the ending see above 18.2.1.; cf. also Ipv I 2.sg. *pkrāsta*), while the *ā*-preterit clearly started out as pre-PT *kärst-.[28] Things are completely different in Tocharian A, where beside Subclass 3 *ā*-preterits we regularly find active paradigms showing root ablaut, and lack of *ā*-umlaut. See chap. Pt I 7.3.4. for a diachronic analysis of this discrepancy and chap. Sound Laws 1.5. for the *ā*-umlaut.

18.4.2.   *The corresponding present stems*

As for associated present stems, only very few ablauting Class V subjunctives of Tocharian B are paired together with Prs III stems, and none with Prs IV stems. All *ā*-subjunctives correlated with Class IV presents show persistent (*)-ā- as root vowel, and initial accent in Tocharian B. The few ablauting Sub V with persistent initial accent correlated with Class III presents are:

märs$^{(a)}$- 'forget' (tr) (m/x/a) (III/V/I) Sub V 2.sg. *mārsat* (MQ), 1.sg. Opt *marsoym*, 3.sg.mid. Opt *marsoytär*, Inf *marsatsi* (MQ); *lu^a-* 'send' (tr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I) Sub V 3.sg. *lāwä<ṃ>* (sic); *sruk^a-* 'die' (itr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I) Sub V

---

[27] 3.pl. *lyipāre* from *lip^a-* 'remain' attested in a business document clearly is not an instance of a Subclass 1 Pt I made from that root, because there exists also a variation *lipa/lyīpa* in the 3.sg., and *lyip-* just seems to be a blend of the lautgesetzlich result of pre-PT *lip-, i.e., PT *l'äp-, and the analogical result thereof, i.e., PT *läyp-.

[28] *lit^a-/^{A}lit$^{(a)}$-* is a special case, because it shows both a zero-grade stem *lit-ā-* and a full-vowel stem *laitā-/* TA *letā-* both in the *ā*-preterit of TA and TB and in the *ā*-subjunctive of TA.

1.sg. *sraukau*, 3.sg. *sraukaṃ*, 3.sg. Opt *srūkoy*, Ger II *srukalle*, Abstr II *srukalñe*; *tsäṅk^ᵃ-* '(a)rise' (itr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I) Sub V 1.sg. *tsäṅkau* (MQ), 3.sg. *tsāṅkaṃ*, 3.pl. *tsaṅkaṃ*, 3.sg. Opt *tsaṅkoy*, 3.pl. Opt *tsäṅkon-me* (DA), Ger II *tsäṅkälle* (MQ)/*tsaṅkälyai* (MQ)/*tsäṅkälyi* (MQ)/*tsaṅkalyana*, Abstr II *tsaṅkalñe*, Inf *tsaṅkatsi.*

As for *tuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'hide', the attested present *cukemar* can be Prs II as well as Prs III, so it is uncertain whether the root belongs here as well. The other TB Class V subjunctives correlated with Class III presents from intransitive grundverbs are almost exclusively media tantum lacking initial accent. In Tocharian A, the Sub V paired together with Class III presents show active inflection, ablaut, and lack of *ā*-umlaut.

18.4.3.   *Correlation of accent with voice, valency, and other factors*

Marggraf, 1970, 24ff. was the first scholar to suggest that the accentuation of TB Sub V forms had to do with, and actually was conditioned by the issues of voice and valency. This is what he thought was the basic accent rule for TB finite[29] Sub V forms: "Die Konjunktive der Klasse V sind ungeachtet der Diathese des Verbs regelmäßig auf der ersten Silbe betont. Unter den medialen Formen hat sich aber eine formale Kennzeichnung einer Opposition *transitiv* (unmarkiert) : *intransitiv / passiv* (markiert durch Suffixbetonung) herausgebildet" (Marggraf, 1970, 31). Granted that this rule seems to work perfectly for one stem, viz., *mrauskā-* (see above), it makes many wrong predictions otherwise: e.g., *makamar*, *mā̆ntsantär*, and *rākoyentär-ñ* are used intransitively and bear the accent on the initial syllable nevertheless; there are much more active forms (NB of transitive valency) that do not conform to Marggraf's rule, and lack word-initial accent completely. Marggraf, 1970, 29 (followed later by Hilmarsson, 1991, 75ff.) tried to cope with the evidence of these Sub V stems (*tättā́-*, *läkā́-*, *śuwā́-*) by claiming that precisely in these very subjunctive stems the stem-final *-ā-* was something completely different from the stem-final *-ā-* in all the other Sub V stems, so that these subjunctives should rather be taken for Sub I than for Sub V stems, which is a very arbitrary claim, and has therefore been rightly rejected, together with Marggraf's whole accentual theory, by Eyþórsson, 1993, 65. However, Marggraf deserves the credit for

---

[29] Marggraf did not make such a claim for the non-finite forms; according to him, these "lehnen sich — auch bei passivischer Funktion — formal vollständig an die finiten Formen des Aktivs an".

having seen correctly that most of the TB Sub V paradigms lacking word-initial accent are media tantum, used intransitively, and paired with presents of Class III, whereas with the exception of the Sub V forms of *ārt(t)⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'love', "nur aktivische Konjunktive" are attested beside "den medialen *o*-Präsentia [i.e., the presents of Class IV]" (Marggraf, 1970, 26).

Winter, 1980, 427ff. = 2005, 209ff. arranged the material differently, i.e., by the respective present classes standing beside subjunctive stems of Class V. Based on this arrangement he came to the conclusion that TB subjunctives of Class V have "initial accent as a mark of transitiveness" (1980, 439 = 2005, 221). He did not discuss possible diachronic reasons for this rule of valency marking. Winter's view appears to be correct only as long as one does not take into account evidence other than to be found in his list: almost all of the intransitive subjunctives of Class V standing beside a present of Class III indeed do not show initial accent in the subjunctive stem,[30] and it is also true that all of the transitive subjunctives of Class V standing beside both nasal presents and *ā*-preterits with palatalized root initial indeed show initial accent. However, this is only a selection from all the subjunctives belonging to Class V. Winter keeps quiet about all the roots forming presents of Class IV that are likewise intransitive media tantum, and have beside them Sub V paradigms as well. Since all of these intransitive (almost exclusively active) Sub V paradigms show initial accent as well, as a consequence initial accent cannot have been a general marker of transitivity in Tocharian B at all.[31] Consequently, also Winter's view was rightly rejected by Eyþórsson, 1993, 65ff.

As for Eyþórsson's own solution, he suggests that at an earlier stage, all Sub V paradigms with root ablaut had "root accent in the active singular and suffixal accent elsewhere", i.e., "had a mobile accent paradigm with accented *o*-grade in the strong stem but unaccented zero grade in the weak stem", claiming that in "the type *sráukā-/srúkā*- this mobile accent paradigm has been leveled in favor of the root accent of the active singular (ousting *sräwká-)", and further assuming that the accent patterns of the Class I subjunctives had been "analogous to those of the originally identical class V" (Eyþórsson, 1993, 59, 63;[32] 68f.; cf. also 1997, 242). Given the fact that

---

[30] For the exceptions, see the detailed discussion in chap. Prs III/IV 26.2.5.

[31] To be sure, initial accent is a mark of kausativum paradigms, but this is clearly a morphologically defined category.

[32] "The tendency towards a generalization of root accent in ablauting subjunctives with an original mobile accent paradigm was a late analogical

persistent word-initial accent is the synchronically regular pattern for ablauting Sub V (and Sub I), the few (mostly non-finite) forms with root vowel -*ä*- irregularly lacking word-initial accent that can be found in both subjunctive classes indeed rather give the impression of being archaisms, so that Eyþórsson's claim looks quite reasonable, at least at first sight. It is not really backed, however, by the evidence from the media tantum among the Sub V paradigms showing a surfacing root vowel -*ä*-: on the one hand, there are many intransitive media tantum lacking word-initial accent completely,[33] but on the other hand, the three middle-only Sub V paradigms made from the roots *mäk*[(a)]- 'run', *rit*[ā]- 'seek', and *wärp*[ā]- 'feel, enjoy' do have persistent word-initial accent.

The main problem with Eyþórsson's theory is, however, that he cannot explain any occurrence of word-initial accent in Tocharian B at all. If I understand him correctly, he prefers to assume that a PIE mobile accent paradigm had been preserved into Tocharian B directly,[34] but this is, in my opinion, quite improbable, given the fact that in all other nominal and verbal categories, Tocharian B shows reflexes of an accentuation system completely different from the one in Vedic and Ancient Greek, and usually reconstructed for PIE. I also cannot follow other claims by Eyþórsson, 1993: p. 61f. he seems to claim that a causative alternation by voice alternation is attested for what he calls the *tsā́mā-/tsämā́* type, i.e., ablauting Sub V with initial accent in the sg. active as opposed to non-initial accent in all the other forms. But as already argued above, the existence of an active form *tsāmat* is not too certain (let alone a transitive meaning), and the only certain example of what one would call a mobile accent pattern, i.e., the Sub V from *käsk*[(a)]- 'scatter' with a 2.sg.act. *kāskat* vs. a mid. *käskātär* does not show causative alternation, but passivization instead.[35] Based on the wrong example *tsā́mā-/tsämā́* Eyþórsson then

process which had not been entirely completed by the time of our Tocharian texts."

[33] "It is also probable that some of the suffix accented subjunctives to ablauting roots with no active forms attested are media tantum, and that their weak forms were therefore not subject to the analogical accent shift" (Eyþórsson, 1993, 63, fn. 55).

[34] Cf. "the concomitant mobile accent was likewise inherited" (Eyþórsson, 1993, 63), "Tocharian accent turns out to preserve features far more archaic than previously imagined" (Eyþórsson, 1993, 69; similarly 1997, 242).

[35] Note that in Sub V forms, no causative alternation by voice alternation can be found at all, i.e., the Sub V is a stem formation where simple voice

states that "intransitive middles to ablauting roots may have resisted the analogical accent shift more tenaciously than transitive ones" (p. 67f.), in order to explain what he thinks was the preservation of an archaic pattern.

Hilmarsson, 1991, 79ff. and 1991c, 78f. does not follow Marggraf's claim (1970, 33f.) that ablauting subjunctives show initial accent, non-ablauting ones non-initial accent, because of the counterexamples as discussed above. Hilmarsson's strategy is to connect the accent pattern of the subjunctives stem Classes I and V with the respective preterit stems rather than with voice and valency. Since non-ablauting Class I subjunctives standing beside $\bar{a}$-preterits do not have persistent initial accent just like $\bar{a}$-preterits never show persistent initial accent, Hilmarsson claimed that initial accent in the subjunctive stem is rather to be connected with the initial accent in the s-preterit, whereas suffix accent in the subjunctive stem is to be connected with the suffix accent in the $\bar{a}$-preterit.

However, this scenario does not cover the facts entirely nor does it explain the accent patterns. An athematic subjunctive of Class I is nearly always associated with an s-preterit, and the alleged exceptions brought forth by Hilmarsson for such a pattern outside a correlation with Pt III are to be explained otherwise. In favor of his theory he could just adduce one example of a Sub I paired with Pt I, viz. *sälp$^{ā?}$-*. The root indeed forms an $\bar{a}$-preterit but the subjunctive class of Tocharian B is at least unclear (see the discussion s.v. *sälp$^{ā?}$-*), and Tocharian A has Sub V as expected. As for the other examples discussed by Hilmarsson or to be found in the manuals, the $\bar{a}$-preterit of *tränk-* 'lament' showing root-final palatalization is undoubtedly secondarily based on the (now even attested) secondary thematic subjunctive stem.[36] *plāk-* 'agree' contrarily to what the manuals state does not form an $\bar{a}$-preterit stem at all, but an s-preterit stem as expected. The subjunctive stem of *miw$^{(a)}$-* 'tremble' cannot be anything

---

alternation evidently was not used to express causative alternation. On the other hand, only two roots with A-character show causative alternation at all, but not in the Sub V: for *pärs^a-* act. 'sprinkle', mid. 'spray' no finite Sub V form is attested; as for ^{AB}*mänt$^{(a)}$-* act. 'stir; destroy', mid. 'be angry' (also 'destroy (for oneself)', 'be destroyed'), the one TB middle form from the Sub V attested is precisely not intransitive; in TA no finite Sub V form is attested, but here causative alternation by voice alternation is found in the corresponding Prs V (TB has two different Prs stems instead).

[36] NB the s-imperfect in TA shows that the root indeed had an s-preterit stem in PT as expected from a non-A-character root.

else than of Class V, and the same goes for *yaukkᵃ̊-* 'use'. The subjunctive from *soy-* 'satiate', on the other hand, was diachronically a thematic formation, as Hilmarsson, l.c., acknowledged himself. Finally, *wäs-* 'wear' forms an *s*-preterit, and *wär⁽ᵃ⁾(-sk)-* 'smell' must once have formed a thematic present > subjunctive as well.

As for the rule that subjunctives of Class I when standing beside an *s*-preterit (which, as was said before, almost all do) show persistent initial accent, it was shown above that there are exceptions from a synchronic point of view. And as for the accent in the *s*-preterit itself, Winter only a bit later after Hilmarsson's article showed that its accent pattern was completely different from those of Sub I and V (see chap. Pt III 9.1.1.), so that interparadigmatic leveling is out of the question here. Finally, the persistent initial accent found in subjunctive Class I certainly should be seen together with the same phenomenon in the subjunctive of Class V, and Class V subjunctives are certainly always correlated with a Class I preterit, which never have persistent initial accent.

18.5. ACCENT: SUMMARY

As has become clear from the preceding paragraph, the (more or less) persistent word-initial accent in Sub I and Sub V defies any inner-Tocharian explanation. Apart from the quite exceptional[37] case of the Sub V stem *mrauskā-*, which evidently functioned as its own causative (or anticausative, respectively), a fact which obviously caused the finite intransitive middle forms to undergo a secondary accent shift (maybe modeled on causative **nékä-/*nákä-* vs. anticausative **näké-*, etc.), the presence or absence of persistent word-initial accent in forms of Sub I and Sub V paradigms certainly has nothing to do with the issues of voice and valency, and cannot be explained as a (direct) result of any kind of inner-Tocharian paradigmatic leveling (i.e., intraparadigmatic or interparadigmatic leveling) either. Accordingly, one must search for a diachronic explanation.

Unexpected word-initial accent in TB polysyllables has long been explained by the former presence of a reduplication syllable consisting of the root-initial non-syllabic and a reduplication vowel PT

---

[37] Exceptional, but not unparalleled, cf. similar cases such as *iyā-* denoting both 'go, travel' and 'lead, cause to go', and *kärsā-* denoting both 'know' and 'make know(n)'.

*ä; see, e.g., TEB I, 247, § 442,1 Anm., and, most recently, Winter, 1994a, 306ff. = 2005, 487ff.; Rasmussen, 2002, 379; Kim, 2005, 194; 2007, 188f. But as far as I can see, no principled theory about the presence and absence of word-initial accent in subjunctive Classes I and V has been brought forth so far.

It seems that word-initial accent is consistently met in those classes whenever the root vowel is a full vowel, the only systematic exceptions are non-finite forms built from roots of the *kolok-/*kālākā-* type (i.e., *parākatsi* and *sanāpatsi*); on the other hand, *parākatsi* and *sanāpatsi* excepted, word-initial accent is only absent when the root vowel clearly derives from a PT *ä, so that a first guess might be that at an earlier stage of development, no PT *ä acting as root vowel had borne the accent in any Sub I/V paradigm at all, and that the cases of stressed root vowel PT *ä reflect some kind of paradigmatic leveling in favor of how originally only singular active allomorphs with the full vowel PT *æ had behaved. However, such a rather simple solution would be hampered by the fact that we find initial accent also in the all-middle Sub V paradigms from the roots *mäk^(a)-* 'run', *rit^a-* 'seek', and *wärp^a-* 'feel, enjoy' (and in the infinitive from the possible all-middle Sub V from *luk^(a)-* 'light up' *lukatsi* as well).

At this point of the argument, one should remember that the PT vowels *ä and *æ no doubt had various different pre-PT origins.

18.6. DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

Just like the *ā*-preterit, the *ā*-subjunctive has often been compared to what were thought to be formations in PIE "*ā", notably the Celtic and Italic *ā*-subjunctive (see, e.g., Pedersen, 1941, 199: "Er ist natürlich mit dem italisch-keltischen *ā*-Konjunktiv zu vergleichen"). But whereas the "-*ā*-" is a special subjunctive morpheme in both Celtic and Italic descriptively,[38] "the PT *-a- of the Tocharian *a*-subjunctive is apparently the final segment of the verb root, *a*-subjunctive being simply athematic subjunctives to roots in *-a-" (Ringe, 1991, 97 with ref.). As already seen by many scholars before, that stem-final PT *-ā- must have spread from the respective preterits. Most notably Winter on various occasions (1961, 89 = 1984, 160 = 2005, 28; 1977, 147f. = 1984, 193 = 2005, 184f.; 1982, 9 = 1984, 228f. = 2005, 259; 1994a, 286f. =

---

[38] For the now quite common view that the Celtic "*ā*"-subjunctive morpheme has even nothing to do at all with the Italic one, see most recently Schumacher, 2004, 53ff.

2005, 467f.) followed, e.g., by Kim, 2004, 224, fn. 72, and 2007, 196, sees in (at least most of) the Sub I and Sub V paradigms just the respective preterits turned into futures via substitution of the preterit endings by the present endings (which is a strategy somewhat reminiscent of, but ultimately nevertheless completely different from what I call the *tēzzi* principle), and quite similar views can also be found in Couvreur, 1947a, 73 and 103, § 122, and in various papers by Lane (most recently Lane, 1970, 78f.): "I believe I succeeded in showing that so far as Tocharian was concerned, the evidence of the *ā*-preterit and the *ā*-subjunctive showed that the preterit value of this formation was the earlier. [...] Tocharian [...] stands out among the Indo-European languages as preserving the *ā*-formation in its original value as a preterit and in its secondary use as a subjunctive. [...] As in Italic and Celtic, the original use as an injunctive led (with 'primary' endings) to a predominantly modal use, but a few verbs even with such endings remained as indicatives. On the other hand, under the influence of Slavic the preterit value was retained and even expanded."[39]

It has to be stressed, however, that the non-ablauting Sub V paradigms with persistent root vowel (*)-*ā*- differ from the respective Pt I paradigms with respect to accent in Tocharian B, and that the other Sub V paradigms differ from the respective Pt I paradigms quite often in even more ways, and again especially in Tocharian B: ablauting Sub V have, as a rule, a (more or less) persistent word-initial accent in Tocharian B, whereas the respective Pt I formations never do so; beside intransitive active-only Pt I paradigms with a root vowel PT *(')ä, in Tocharian B quite often intransitive middle-only Sub V paradigms with a root vowel PT *(')ä are found; and maybe most importantly, there are (practically) no ablauting Pt I paradigms that have non-palatalizing PT *æ as root vowel in the singular of the active paradigm.

---

[39] If the Italic *ā*-subjunctive had developed out of the same aorist injunctive that evidently resulted in what Rix, 1998 called "der altitalische Präventiv" (i.e., was based on that preventive mood), there is then indeed still good reason to say that the Tocharian Sub V and the Italic *ā*-subjunctive ultimately belonged together somehow, against the current fashion according to which the two categories should be kept completely apart.

18.6.1.   *The ablauting Sub I and Sub V paradigms*

18.6.1.1. *The PIE perfect theory*

Traditionally, the *o*/zero-grade ablaut to be seen in many of the
subjunctives of Class I and V is explained by deriving these two
formations directly from the classical PIE perfect, mainly because this
has been the only suffixless PIE verbal category for which such an
ablaut was reconstructed by traditional IE linguistics. This analysis
was proposed for the subjunctive of Class I first by Van Windekens,
1944, 267; see also Lane, 1959, 160ff.; 1962, 64ff.; Cowgill, 1967, 171ff. =
2006, 445ff. (though with hesitation); Adams, 1978, 280f.; 1988a, 77ff.;
Hilmarsson, 1991, 37;[40] Klingenschmitt, 1994, 406f. = 2005, 431f., fn.
164; Winter, 1994a, 305ff. = 2005, 486ff.; Rasmussen, 1997, 146; 2002,
379; Hackstein, 2005, 171, fn. 8; Kim, 2007, 188ff.[41]

It was Cowgill, 1967, 171ff. = 2006, 445ff. who stated first that the
ablauting Class I and Class V subjunctives differ with respect to their
formation only by presence or absence of stem-final (*)-*ā*-.

Apart from the ablaut issue, PIE active perfect morphology was
also invoked in order to explain the synchronically irregular initial
accent of the subjunctives of Class I and V as a reflex of the former
reduplication syllable, which caused the accent to be on the root
syllable, where it survived after the reduplication syllable had been
lost. The loss of the reduplication syllable is easily explained by the
fact that an inherited reduplication vowel PIE *e > PT *ä would have
been lost by sound law in open syllables, i.e., in all cases where the
root began with a single consonant.

There are indeed inner-TB parallels for initial-syllable accentuation
after loss of reduplication syllable:
In the TB imperative a 2.pl.act. like *kalas* (from *käl*[ᵃ]- 'lead') as if from
*kắlāsä has to be explained in view of the fact that the form is still
accented as though it were constructed with the usual imperative
particle *pä*-, so *kalas* may simply reflect the accent of **päkắlāsä*. It has
to be noted that the *kalas* type is the usual accent type of imperatives

---

[40] "I think the subjunctive of class V in principle continue Indo-European
perfects"; note that Hilmarsson made this remark a propos of non-ablauting
tắkā-.

[41] Kim, 2007, 191f. states that the Sub V forms with non-initial accent are
created on the Class III present stems with ref. to a paper to appear in MSS
(according to Kim, 2007, 197, he apparently derives Prs III from "PIE stative
*-*eh₁*-").

without particle, whereas the 2.pl.act. *lämā́s* (from *läm^(ā)-* 'sit'), i.e., *lämā́sä* is the synchronically reanalyzed form, and it is only attested in an eastern text, where informal-style/late features are expected. Note further that the informal-style forms of *yām-* 'do' of the type 1.sg. Pt *maṣṣawa* from *yamaṣṣawa* also keep the accent of the initial syllable after the deletion of the root-initial syllable *ya-.*

However, Jasanoff, 1988, 56 and 1992, 136 objects to the derivation from the classical, reduplicated PIE perfect that the only certain reflex of the PIE perfect, namely the preterit participle of the type *papaikau* does show reduplication. It should further be noted that the dereduplicated types of the PPt precisely do not have initial accent.

Kümmel, 2004, 158 further points out: "Gerade bei einer *o*-stufigen Bildung würde man jedoch Reduplikationsvokal **o > *ë* erwarten", which is based on the assumption that the reduplication vowel **æ* in the PPt is due to an assimilation to the *æ*-grade in the root. But since an assimilation like this need not have been a sound law, and is just a way to explain the preservation of the reduplication syllable in the PPt, I do not see how this is an argument against former reduplication in the ablauting subjunctives.

A further argument against the assumption of former reduplicated forms that has, to my knowledge, not been adduced so far is the fact that the TA *krasaṣ*-type forms do show vowel reduction by vowel balance, and since Winter, 1994, 405f. = 2005, 454f. is certainly right in claiming that lack of such vowel balance in imperative forms of the type TA *pkāmār* is precisely due to the former trisyllabic structure of these imperative forms, one could argue that here we have a proof that the Sub V forms like TA *krasaṣ* just go back to disyllabic preforms. But see the discussion of my own views on reduplication below 18.7.

18.6.1.2. *Non-perfect o-grade theories*

Instead of the classical PIE perfect, some scholars rather want to derive the formation from unreduplicated athematic PIE present stem formation, namely athematic, non-reduplicated present stems with o/e (later o/ø) ablaut of the type $*molh_2e$, see the argumentation by Pinault, 1984c, 122f. and 1989, 146 (beside the perfect/seṭ root theory) based on Jasanoff's derivation (1979, 85) of Prs *nesäṃ* < **nos-* (but see below Jasanoff, 1992). Similarly, Kümmel, 2004, 140ff. sets up an athematic root present without reduplication and ó/é ablaut which has a subtype with ó/ø ablaut. As in the case of root nouns, Kümmel states that in this root present the old ablaut ó/é was preserved in

roots ending in obstruents, while the (more often attested structure) of CeRC roots shows the ó/ø ablaut. However, in Tocharian "wurde vereinheitlicht zu R(o)- ~ R(z) bzw. innertocharisch "ë-Stufe" : "ə-Stufe"". As (certain) direct evidence he lists (p. 151ff.): *nesau* 'am' (PIE *nos- 'heimkommen'), *preku* 'ask' (PIE *prok̂- 'fragen'), "*lāwaṃ*" 'send' (PIE *loṷH- 'abtrennen, lösen'), *wikātär* 'disappear' (PIE *ṷoi̯g- 'weichen'), and *kewu* 'pour' (PIE *ĝʰoṷ- 'gießen, schütten'). Again differently, Oettinger, 2006, 41f. derives Class I and V subjunctives from formerly reduplicated present stems with o/ø ablaut and h_2e-endings to which he assigns the pre-PIE function "Proto-Intensivum" being the ancestor of the classical PIE perfect, the reduplicated present of the type *dʰé-dʰoh₁-ti, the full-reduplicated intensive present, and (with dereduplication) the Hittite *ḫi*-conjugation.

Jasanoff, 1988, 59f. and in detail 1992, 141ff. derived the ablauting Class I and V subjunctives from PIE root aorists with o/ø ablaut (formerly o/e ablaut) and the h_2e-ending set. He objected to the assumption that the difference in stem character in Class I and Class V is due to inherited aniṭ or seṭ character, because "the enormous preponderance of descriptively "*aniṭ*" roots among the verbs that form *ā*-subjunctives makes this possibility rather unlikely" (p. 133). Instead he claims that the *ā*-subjunctive has rather acquired the suffix *-ā*- analogically from the corresponding *ā*-preterit: "pre-Tocharian subjunctives with *o : *ø ablaut were analogically extended by a semantically vacuous *-ā- if the corresponding preterit ended in *-ā-, but not otherwise" (1992, 133). To be sure, the suffix *-ā- in these *ā*-preterits is also analogical in the first place (as per Jasanoff, 1992, 151, fn. 25), the inherited stem-suffix *-å̄- is still preserved in the PPt, and the *-ā- of the preterit proper is taken over from the *ā*-preterits going back to h_2-aorists (see chap. Pt I 7.3.3.).

Since a great part of the Class V subjunctives has a present of Class III or IV beside it, he further claims that word equations with Hittite *ḫi*-conjugation verbs and such Class III/IV verbs like PIE *√ṷag 'break' (Hitt. *wāki)* : *wāk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'split apart' points to a common source, and "a number of Vedic aorist passives correspond etymologically to Tocharian class I and V subjunctive" (Ved. *ahāvi* to *ku-* 'pour'; Ved. *aseci* from *sic-* 'pour out' with ᴬ*sik⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be overflown'; Ved. *aroci* with *luk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'light up'; Ved. *ábhrāji* with *pälk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'burn'). For that reason, he

derives the Vedic passive aorist[42] from the same PIE root aorist formation, i.e., an o/ø-aorist type with the h_2e-ending set.

As for the fact that the *ā*-subjunctives corresponding to the media tantum Class III/IV presents often inflect actively, Jasanoff assumes that this proto-middle h_2e-ending set was analogically replaced by active endings (1992, 143) and "failed to undergo the renewal *-e → *-(t)o [...] and became "active"", i.e., a 3.sg. "*mors-e and similar forms were interpreted morphologically as actives, and hence preserved their ablaut, in pre-Tocharian".

As for non-ablauting Class I subjunctives standing beside a Class I present, he thinks that they are inherited present stem formations (1992, 151, fn. 28).

Rasmussen, 2002, 379 objects to Jasanoffs derivation of the ablauting Class I and V formations from acrostatic, athematic root aorists that this theory fails to explain the initial accent.

Differently, Jasanoff, 2003, 200f. assumes that the ablauting Class I subjunctives of the type *näk-* go back to "h_2e-conjugation aorists of the presigmatic type", and the ablauting Class V subjunctives to "h_2e-conjugation aorists of the stative-intransitive type", because the first is associated with Class III *s*-preterits, while the latter is associated with intransitive Class III/IV presents (2003, 157ff.).

Finally, Peters, 2004, 434, fn. 24 was the first to make use of what I call the *tēzzi* principle in this context, but he set up the subjunctive forms in question without reduplication syllable and did not comment on the initial accent.

18.7.   SUB I AND V AND THE *tēzzi* PRINCIPLE

As long recognized,[43] many of the Sub I and Sub V paradigms look very similar to the respective Pt III and Pt I paradigms. Although

---

[42] A connection between Sub V *kārsaṃ* with the Vedic passive aorist 3.sg. *aśrāvi* 'was heard' was argued by Hollifield apud Jasanoff, 1984, 92. In a similar way, Schmidt, 1997c, 557ff. assumes that the 3.sg. Pt *klāwa* is the direct cognate of the Ved. passive aorist *śrāvi*, etc., and thus "nichts anderes als der direkte Fortsetzer einer intransitiv-passivischen Perfektbildung *$\hat{k}lou̯$-ə", but see chap. Pt I 7.3.5., and note that the origin of the Vedic passive aorist is controversial itself.

[43] See, e.g., TG, 325: "In den meisten Paradigmen fallen Präterital- und Konjunktivstamm zusammen"; p. 341: "Zahlreiche Konjunktive sind von den Indikativen des Präteritums tatsächlich nur durch die Wahl anderer Personalendungen geschieden".

there are also some differences, viz. with respect to the root ablaut in the active plural paradigms of Sub I and Pt III, and with respect to accentuation in Tocharian B, in general many of these Sub and Pt paradigms resemble each other so much that it really seems best to assume that at least a major part of the respective subjunctives had started out as presents which had been formed on the basis of respective preterits via what I call the *tēzzi* principle at a time when those preterits had not undergone some essential changes (such as loss of reduplication and loss of ablaut in the active paradigms).

18.7.1.   *Word-initial accent and reduplication*

As far as I can see, the word-initial accent seen in the active paradigms of TB Sub I, Sub V, and kausativum subjunctives and presents can indeed best be explained diachronically if one is willing to assume that in at least some of these different kinds of paradigms, or maybe in just one of these morphological categories involved, there had existed reduplicated forms with reduplication syllables of the pre-PT structure *Ce-, which were lost by sound law completely if placed before a syllable-initial non-syllabic sound (see, most recently, Winter, 1994a, 306ff. = 2005, 487ff.; Rasmussen, 2002, 379; Kim, 2005, 194; 2007, 188f.).

18.7.1.1. *In Sub I paradigms*

According to Peters, forthc., a certain number of TB Sub I and Pt III forms with a root vowel TB *(-)o-* can actually be explained in terms of former reduplicated structures of the type PIE *C_ieC_ioC-, e.g., Sub I *wotkäṃ, wotkeṃ*,[44] Pt III *otkasa-me* < PT *wäwætk-, Sub I *oräñ-c*, *wräntär*, Pt III *orwa, orasta, orsa-c* < pre-PT *ār- < PIE *h_2e-$h_2$or(H)- (vs. Pt III 3.pl. *arar-c* < pre-PT *ar- < PIE *h_2e-h_2r̥H-).[45] If one is willing

---

[44] *w-* in Sub I probably because of a reduplication syllable *wä- that was analogically restored some time after pre-PT *u̯eu̯o- had by sound law turned into PT *wo-.

[45] What is more, in some forms of Sub I and V we do not find word-initial accentuation, and in almost all of these cases of absent word-initial accent, the first syllable of the relevant form had a pre-PT *ä, *i, or *u as its vowel, which is strongly reminiscent of the situation in the PPt, which seem to have lacked reduplication originally precisely whenever the respective root vowel had been a pre-PT *ä, *i, or *u; see my more detailed argument below.

to accept Peters' analyses,[46] with respect to ablauting Sub I paradigms with a pre-PT root vowel *o in the active singular there is then actually additional evidence in favor of a former presence of reduplication. On the other hand, in a reduplicated preterit that evidently would have to be viewed as having fused with other kinds of preterits of clearly non-reduplicated origin, the reduplication syllable could have been given up sooner or later by simple analogy, i.e., for purely morphological reasons under the pressure of preterital paradigms contributing to preterit Class III that never ever had any kind of reduplication (as per Winter, 1994a, 306ff. = 2005, 487ff.). One may therefore think it indeed preferable to derive both the ablauting Sub I and the non-ablauting Pt III paradigms with root vowel pre-PT *o in the active singular paradigms from preterits with a structure PIE *C_ieC_ioC- and in addition with a root ablaut pre-PT *o/zero in the active paradigm. There exists just one obvious candidate for such a preterit, viz. a PIE active perfect turned already in pre-PT times into a simple preterit, which had still preserved the original pre-PT *o/zero ablaut.[47] Such a scenario could also prompt an explanation for the two facts that (1) some Pt III and Sub I have an (invariant) root vowel (*)-$\bar{a}$- from PIE = pre-PT *-$\bar{o}$- (as per Peters, 2004, 434, fn. 24), and that (2) the Sub I paradigms that cannot be explained via the *tēzzi* principle (such as those of *ai-* 'give', *nes-* 'be', and *yok-* 'drink'), or cannot have lost a reduplication syllable of the structure *C(')ä- via syncope because of a word-initial vowel or diphthong (such as the ones of *ār(a)-* 'leave, abandon', *eṅk-* 'seize', *er-* 'evoke, cause', *au-n-* 'hit, wound'), either do not show word-initial accent at all,[48] or only show word-initial accent in forms where this accent can also be easily explained as due to a preservation of the *pātär* and *prekwa* accentuation rule (see chap. Sound Laws 1.3.). As far as ablauting Sub I paradigms built via the

---

[46] Note that a similar argument has been advanced by Forssman, 1994, 102f. on behalf of the Hittite *ḫi*-conjugation (not accepted by Jasanoff, 2003, 78, fn. 39).

[47] And not lost under the influence of Narten preterits, as precisely assumed by Winter, l.c.

[48] This is certainly true for the common roots *ai-* 'give', *nes-* 'be', and *yok-* 'drink', and also for the Sub I from *yām-* 'do', which I assume has started out as a present (> subjunctive) formation by the *tēzzi* principle because of its pre-PT *ō*-grade, but may have lost its reduplication syllable quite early in an irregular way (i.e., as a result of borrowing respective reduced forms from the more or most informal into the more formal phonostyles) because of its status as extremely frequent and semantically bleached verb.

tēzzi principle are concerned, in all cases of irregularly absent word-initial accent such as *nkem*, *träṅkalyñe*, etc., the root vowel involved is a PT *ä from pre-PT *ä, which is strongly reminiscent of the situation with reduplication in the PPt: in the PPt, reduplication seems to have been absent in pre-PT times precisely before syllables with a vowel pre-PT *ä, *i, or *u.

18.7.1.2.   *In Sub V paradigms*

As for the Sub V with what seems to be pre-PT *o/zero ablaut, one may then first think that the prototypical paradigms had been formed quite early via the *tēzzi* principle from reduplicated perfects built from PIE seṭ roots still showing pre-PT *o/zero ablaut. However, according to Peters' reasoning the TA ablauting Sub V that correspond to TB all-middle Sub V lacking initial accent are not something archaic, but analogical innovations of Tocharian A only, and about one third even of the TB ablauting Sub V alone is made from Tocharian roots that do not go back to PIE roots, and therefore could not have formed an old perfect at all. Furthermore, in many of these TB subjunctives, and also in TA *krasaṣ*, we meet a very strange kind of schwebeablaut. Finally, the two TB Sub V stems that have possibly been the two most frequent and most important members of the greater class of Sub V formations that are built from roots having -*ä*- as root vowel, and which both do have singular active forms attested and derive from a PIE root and not from a reduplicated present stem,[49] i.e., the TB Sub V made from *läk*[(a)]- 'see' and *śuw*[ä]- 'eat', lack root ablaut and initial accent completely. Since frequently used forms tend to be more conservative with respect to morphology, and since *śuw*[ä]- 'eat' ranks among the very few TB roots that preserve reflexes of the more original Subclass 3 Pt I inflection, it may then be quite reasonable to guess that even the pivotal members of the ablauting subclass of Sub V had not shown a pre-PT *o/zero ablaut right from the start, but rather had started out as presents formed by the *tēzzi* principle with another kind of root ablaut (i.e., pre-PT *e/zero or *zero/zero, according to the ablaut found in the preterit that had been basic to the new former present), and adopted pre-PT *o/zero ablaut only later, under the influence and on the model of the Sub I paradigms with such an ablaut.[50]

---

[49] Such as *tattaṃ* 'put, set, place' from PIE *d^hi/e-$d^h(o/e)h_1$-.

[50] This view seems to be somehow confirmed by the behavior of the root *mit*[(a)]- 'set out', which evidently goes back to a PIE seṭ root *√$mei̯th_2$, and I

If one is willing to follow this reasoning, one might then further suspect that also the initial accent found within the ablauting Sub V paradigms may be owed simply to an analogical influence from the Sub I paradigms. In that case one has to ask, however, why we find initial accent also in the all-middle Sub V paradigms from the roots *mäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'run', *ritᵃ-* 'seek', and *wärpᵃ-* 'feel, enjoy', and in the infinitive *lukatsi* from the possibly all-middle Sub V from *luk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'light up' as well? On the evidence of these forms, I think it is best to assume that at some stage of the development that followed the analogical dereduplication of the Class III preterits that had started out as reduplicated perfects, all former presents that had been built from preterits via the *tēzzi* principle and were still felt to be based on synchronically unreduplicated preterits, acquired analogical reduplication, scil. on the model of the presents that later turned into the ablauting kind of Sub I, and which had been precisely based on former perfect paradigms still reduplicated and showing pre-PT *o/zero ablaut. As is also evidenced by the PPt, as a next step the reduplication vowel pre-PT *e must have turned into pre-PT *ä, *i, *u in front of syllables having *ä, *i, *u as vowel,[51] and the resulting reduplication syllables *Cä-, *Ci-, *Cu- then must have been subsequently lost (probably because of hypershort duration rather than by haplology, which was not applied to pre-PT *CᵢeCᵢe-; see immediately below) without leaving any trace.[52] On the other hand, pre-PT *Ce- occurring before syllables with other vowels (including not only pre-PT *ē, *a, *ā, *o, *ō, *ū, but also pre-PT *e) seems to have been quite generally preserved: as PT *C(')ä- in indicative forms (as also strongly suggested by the old present stem PT *tättā- > TB *tättā- with PT *ä even finally preserved thanks to irregular root-initial

---

guess had preserved both a PIE root aorist (still reflected in the Sub V) and a PIE active perfect indeed until very late. But the only historically preserved Pt is a Pt III (attested in both branches); i.e., in the paradigm of this very verb, root-final pre-PT *-a- (although formerly surfacing in the aorist) was precisely not analogically introduced into the old perfect stem.

[51] Accordingly, pre-PT will have innovated with respect to reduplication vowels much in same way as, e.g., Indo-Iranian, with the exception that pre-PT also had a third short high vowel, scil. *ä, which evidently underwent the same treatment with respect to reduplication as *i and *u. For a similar assumption, see already Krause, WTG, 156, § 157,4.

[52] Note that as a consequence of this loss of hypershort reduplication syllables probably all middle perfect forms and middle (I) root aorist forms must haven fallen together in just one single form.

gemination, as per Winter, 1994a, 307f. = 2005, 488f.), thereby ultimately leading to TB forms with word-initial accent (as a direct consequence of the lautgesetzlich loss of unstressed PT *ä in open syllables of pre-TB and pre-TA), and like PT *C(')æ- (probably as a result of Peters' rule, as per Peters, 2004, 441), (originally) only in participles.[53] By this scenario, forms such as *makamar* and *lukatsi* can be explained as deriving from pre-PT *e*-grade forms *memek-,[54] *leleu̯k- (for the root *luk⁽ᵃ⁾-*, irregular pre-PT *e*-grade is attested by a number of historical forms with irregular root-initial *ly-* such as *lyuketär*; *lukatsi* then must show analogical depalatalization), and would be completely parallel to ancestor forms of PPts such as *lyelyku* of the type pre-PT *lelekäw° > PT *l'äl'äkäwu > *l'æl'äkäwä, i.e., with a reduplication syllable still preserved in PT times in front of a syllable with pre-PT *e as its vowel.

Forms like *käskātär* standing beside 2.sg.act. *kāskat* then much like the Sub I forms of the type *nkem* and *tränkalyñe* will reflect the older state of affairs with a reduplication syllable pre-PT *Cä- immediately deleted, and ought to be compared to PPts without reduplication syllable such as †*ku* (cf. *kuwermeṃ*) from pre-PT *kukuw° and *ltu* from pre-PT *lulutäw°. On the other hand, the *tarkalyñe*-type forms much as the *klaṅkälyñe*-type forms in Sub I will reflect structurally younger ancestral forms with a pre-PT reduplication syllable *Ce- generalized, i.e., by analogy even introduced into a position before pre-PT *Cä/i/u-, and thereby ought to be compared to PPts with analogically restored pre-PT *Ce- (which was ultimately to turn into PT *Cæ-) standing before pre-PT *Cä/i/u-, such as TA *laltu* from pre-PT *lelutäw°.[55]

---

[53] In a few PPt forms, the reduplication vowel pre-PT *e standing in front of a syllable with a vowel other than pre-PT *ä, *i, *u evidently was not turned into PT *æ, viz. in TB/TA *yāmu*, TA *to*, probably as a result of an informal-style treatment.

[54] According to Peters, forthc., the medium tantum root *mäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'run' is to be connected with the Greek medium tantum root μαχ-'fight' (cf. μάχλος 'lewd [said of women]', [ModHG] '*läufig*'), and a PIE root *√megʰH 'run' should be set up (Greek μαχε- < *mekʰa- via vowel metathesis); *ritᵃ-* 'seek', and *wärpᵃ-* 'feel, enjoy' can also have been roots showing pre-PT *e*-grade only; for the latter, Peters, forthc., proposes a full-grade pre-PT *u̯rep- and a connection with Greek ῥέπω 'sink, incline towards, happen'.

[55] Accordingly, I think that Eyþórsson's 1993 assumption was basically correct (except for the diachronic explanation advanced by him).

As for the non-initial accent seen in *parākatsi* and *sanāpatsi* that is reminiscent of the non-initial accent in *käskātär* and *kätkālñe*, this behavior of the *kālākā*-type roots then points to former reduplication with a pre-PT *Cä- type, and not a pre-PT *Ce- type syllable, and thereby seems to confirm Peters' claim (2004, 441f.) that *CāRāCā- < *CæRāCā- replaced older *CäRāCā- at least as far as the typical weak-stem forms of ablauting Sub V paradigms are concerned. However, note that the surface generalization of *CāRāCā- < *CæRāCā- need not be explained by Peters' phonological rule, but could simply be due to the fact that an ablaut alternation *CāRāCā- < *CæRāCā-/*CäRāCā- would have had to be exceedingly rare, and therefore could most easily be given up just for morphological reasons.

18.7.1.3.   *In kausativum presents and subjunctives*

With respect to the claims made immediately above in 18.7.1.2. about TB word-initial accent owed to former reduplication with a pre-PT *Ce- type syllable, it seems quite appropriate to comment upon the word-initial accent in the TB kausativum presents and subjunctives already in this chapter.

The word-initial accent found with them cannot be original at all. This accent (or maybe still reduplication with a syllable of the pre-PT *Ce- type) must have been transferred to them from another, more archaic kind of present stem formation, because the historical kausativum presents and subjunctives of Class IXb have clearly not been formed by the *tēzzi* principle, and some of them have a root vowel *-ä- from pre-PT *-ä- and not pre-PT *-e-, such as *taläskau*, and therefore should not have had a reduplication syllable of the pre-PT *Ce- type, but of the pre-PT *Cä- type, which should have been immediately deleted, as already rightly noticed by Kim, 2004, 225f., fn. 75.

The kausativum formations of Class IXb accordingly must have replaced more archaic presents reduplicated with syllables of the pre-PT *Ce- type that had been formed via the *tēzzi* principle, and which must have had a root vowel other than pre-PT *ä, *i, *u at least in the singular forms of the active paradigm, from where a reduplication syllable of the type pre-PT *Ce- could have analogically spread into the rest of the paradigm. This is not so exotic a claim. A similar assumption can be found in Kim, 2004, 222ff., esp. 225, who seems to assume that "one or a small number of verbs [...] for some reason replaced their reduplicated presents with new presents in *-sk̂ᵉ/ₒ-". Already Hilmarsson, 1991, 48ff. on the evidence of certain privative

formations and especially on account of the imperatives of Class II cogently concluded that there must have once existed a more archaic "causative subjunctive of class V that has later been totally replaced by a class IX formation as the causative marker -*ṣṣ-* / -*sk-* gained in distribution", which had palatalizing (*)-*ä-* as root vowel, and should ultimately be best "associated with the non-causative palatalized preterite I, which in turn reflects an Indo-European root aorist". This means that a former causative, or rather, kausativum pre-PT *e*-grade subjunctive has to be assumed, which diachronically should be taken within my system as an old present stem formation built on a Pt I of Subclass 1/4 precisely via the *tēzzi* principle — and which according to what I wrote above precisely in that case should have acquired analogical reduplication with syllables of the pre-PT *Ce- type.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE OF CLASS II

19.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT SUBJUNCTIVE CLASS II

The following 44 verbs form a subjunctive of Class II (39 TB, 15 TA, 10 TB = TA):

āks- 'announce, proclaim, say', *ās-* 'bring, fetch', *aik-* 'know, recognize', *kātk-* 'rejoice, be glad', *kätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. IV/Antigv. 'let pass, cross', *käm-/ ᴬkum-* 'come', *kraup⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'gather, assemble', *klyaus-/ ᴬklyos-* 'hear, listen to', *cämp-/ ᴬcämp-* 'be able to', *ñäsk-* 'demand, desire', *tās-/ ᴬtā(-s)-* 'put, set, place oneself', *tränk-* 'lament', *trik⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv./ ᴬtrik⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'miss, fail, lead astray', *nāsk-* 'bathe, swim', *nusk-* 'squeeze, (de)press', *pāsk-/ ᴬpās-* 'protect, obey', *pälk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv./ ᴬpälk⁽ᵃ⁾ʔ-* 'burn, torment', *ᴬpros-* 'feel ashamed', *pläṅk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'sell', *mān(t)s⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be sorrowful' (or Sub I?), *mus⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'lift, give up', *musk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'make subside', *mely-* 'crush, squeeze', *ᴬyām-* 'do', *yāsk-* 'beg', *yärs-/ ᴬyärs-* 'show respect, affection', *yäs-* 'excite, touch (sexually)', *räk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'extend (over), cover', *lāṃs-* 'work on, perform', *ᴬlä-n-t-* 'go out', *litk⁽ᵃ⁾ʔ-* 'remove', *luk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'illuminate', *lut-* 'remove, cross, leave', *lyäk-* 'lie', *wik⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'avoid', *ᴬwras-* 'feel', *ᴬwles-* 'perform', *śāw-/ ᴬśāw-* 'live', *ṣäṃs-* 'count (as)', *ṣärp-* 'indicate, explain', *säl⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'throw', *soy-* 'become sated', *spärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'get lost, go astray', *tsärk-/ ᴬtsärk-* 'burn; torture'.

Uncertain are: *aiw⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'turn to' (Sub I/II), *kāñmʔ-* '± be merry' (Sub I/II/V), *kätt-* 'put, set (down)' (Sub I/II), *kälm-* '± enable' (Sub I/II), *krämp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'disturb, hinder' (Sub I/II), *kli-n-/ ᴬkli-n-* 'be obliged to' (Sub I/II), *cäṅk-* 'please' (Sub I/II), *tälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'purge' (Sub I/II), *päl-* 'listen closely' (Sub I/II), *yärp-* 'take care, look out' (Sub I/II), *wi-* 'frighten' (Sub I/II), *ᴬtsāk-* 'glow' (Sub I/II), *tsäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'cause to grow, increase' (Sub I/II).

	TB	TA
1.sg.act.	*āksau*	*yāmam*
2.sg.act.	*śämt* (MQ)/ *śämto* (MQ)/ *campät*	*yāmät*
3.sg.act.	*ākṣäṃ*	*klyoṣäṣ*
1.pl.act.	*pāskem* (MQ)	—
2.pl.act.	*triścer*	*śmäc*
3.pl.act.	*trīkeṃ*	*klyoseñc, cämpe*

1.sg.mid.	—	*pāsmār*
2.sg.mid.	—	—
3.sg.mid.	*ākṣtär*	*pāṣtär*
1.pl.mid.	*yaskemtär*	—
2.pl.mid.	—	—
3.pl.mid.	*kraupentär*	*yāmantär*
Ger/Abs	*ākṣalñe*	*pāṣäl*
Inf	*ākṣtsi*	

19.1.1. *Accent in Tocharian B*

Just like the thematic present stem of Class II, the subjunctive stem of Class II usually shows the regular accent pattern. There are only two examples of what seems to be initial accent: on the one hand, the Abstr *ākṣalñe* in 199 a 4 (M) (found beside a couple of attestations of expected *akṣalñe*) from *āks-* 'announce', which may reflect accentuation by the archaic *pātär* rule, and on the other hand the 3.sg.mid. Opt *palyśitär* (Š) from *pälk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Antigv. 'burn'. As for the latter, Hackstein, 1995, 113, fn. 19 assumes an analogy with the respective disyllabic subjunctive form,[1] but note that there exist quite a few other imperfect forms made from a variety of present classes that also show irregular initial accent; see chap. Imp 15.2.

19.1.2. *Preservation of -ä- before °t in Tocharian B*

At least two TB subjunctive Class II forms seem to show preservation of the thematic vowel *-ä-* < pre-PT *-e-* in an open syllable before endings beginning with a dental consonant. As Winter, 1993, 197ff. = 2005, 441ff. has shown, any kind of *ä*-vowel was regularly lost very early before a non-sonorant dental consonant, so that we usually have 3.sg.mid. forms of the type *ākṣtär* < * āks'ätär*. However, there are some exceptions to that rule: the Inf *śäccätsī* (MQ, metrical) from *kätk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* Kaus. IV (or rather Antigv.) 'let pass', where preservation of *-ä-* after the outcome of a cluster *-tk- is, to be sure, quite regular by Winter's rules; and the Inf *melyatsi* (metrical) from *mely-* 'crush', which has to be a recent creation in any case, because we are dealing with a PIE *-ei̯e/o- present, in which PIE *-ei̯e- should have resulted

---

[1] "Initialakzent beruht wahrscheinlich auf analogischer Angleichung an zugehörige Konjunktivform mit lautgesetzlicher Akzentzurückziehung, d.h. *pályśitär* für *pályśitär** nach Konj. *pályśtär* (*)."

by sound law in PT *-'æ-. The 2.sg.act. *(ca)mpät* (Š, metrical) again shows an *-ä-* that helps to avoid a difficult consonant cluster, viz. *-mpt#*. The non-metrical 3.sg.mid. Prs II *lyutätär* (S) from *lut-* 'remove' is maybe only due to a dittography caused by the following *tä* (*lyutatar*) (thus Hackstein, 1995, 143f.), because the text is non-metrical and has standard accentuation, so that one should have expected †*lyutatär*, if not †*lyucatär* at any rate. Actually, any trisyllabic form would have to be a recent substitute of lautgesetzlich **lyutär* presupposed by Prs I/II *witär*, so that assuming dittography is certainly the likeliest solution. Here possibly also belongs the 3.sg.mid. *wiyatär-ne* from *wi-* 'frighten' (Sub I or II).

19.1.3.   *Depalatalization in the infinitive*

The infinitive ending *-(ä)tsi* usually palatalizes a palatalizable final consonant of a TB thematic subjunctive stem. However, the manuals also list cases of deviant behavior (WTG, 123, § 121,6; TEB I, 224, § 404,2). There can be no doubt that TB infinitives from thematic subjunctive stems ending in *-k*, *-ṅk*, *-s*, and *-sk* that show descriptively non-palatal *-s(t)si* had first been subject to palatalization, and then subsequently underwent depalatalization, see Hackstein, 1995, 149f.; Pinault, 1999a, 469; Peyrot, 2008, 87.[2] On the other hand, Hackstein's analysis of the Inf forms *plāktsi* and *raktsi* (found beside thematic 3.sg.act. *rāśäṃ*) as athematic formations is certainly correct, and in the case of *plāktsi*, the new attestations of athematic 3.sg. Sub *plākäṃ* and Ger *plākälle* (which were unavailable to Hackstein) further prove him right. In Tocharian A, thematic present stems usually have infinitives in *-tsi*. The exception are stems ending in *-s-*, which show the mere *-si* also typical of the informal styles of Tocharian B after depalatalization, the resulting *-ss-* finally sometimes being degeminated (TA *klyossi* from ᴬ*klyos-*, TA *tāsy* from ᴬ*tā(-s)-*, TA *pāssi* from ᴬ*pās-*, TA *wassi* from ᴬ*wäs-*, TA *wrasy* from ᴬ*wras-*, TA *wlessi* from ᴬ*wles-*).

---

[2] The development *-ṣtsi* > *-ssi* is actually an informal-style feature that is only rarely attested in standard TB and is more often to be found in TB colloquial texts; see Peyrot, 2008, 87.

19.1.4.   *The root vowel*

Since all members of this class seem to go back to PIE > pre-PT thematic present stems it does not come as a huge surprise that there is (usually) no paradigmatic ablaut attested in Sub II stems.[3]

There is, however, a remarkable difference with respect to the root vowels in present and subjunctive stems of Class II, inasmuch as the Sub II shows only very few examples of a root vowel PT *(')æ. As is discussed in chap. Prs II, it seems to be a characteristic feature of the Prs II stems with a root vowel PT *(')æ precisely not to be paired with a respective Sub II stem. To my knowledge, there exist only two Sub II stems with a root vowel PT *(')æ: *meṃs-* found in the 1.sg.mid. Opt *meṃsīmar* from *mān(t)s*[(ä)]*-* 'be sorrowful', beside which a Prs II with the same root vowel TB -*e-* is indeed to be found, and *lyaitk-* met in the 3.sg. *lyecciṃ* (sic) and the 3.pl. *lyaitkeṃ* from *litk*[(ä)?]*-* 'remove', which is not associated with a Prs II, but with a present of Class IXb (the paradigm looks like an antigrundverb, respectively kausativum, so that indeed no Prs II should be expected).

There is one other (or maybe two other) Sub II form(s) that show a remarkable root ablaut grade, and they were both pointed out by Hackstein, 1995, 139f., i.e., the 3.sg.act. *rāśäṃ* (standing beside an athematic Inf *raktsi*) from *räk*[(ä)]*-* Antigv. 'extend', and the 3.sg.mid. *tsāmtär* from *tsäm*[(ä)]*-* Antigv. 'increase', which, however, may be rather a Sub I form. Hackstein, 1995, 140, fn. 119 is certainly right in his judgment that it is unlikely that we are simply dealing with misspellings (there is now even a second attestation of *tsāmtär-ne* [sic!] available). He proposes that the ablaut grade was analogically taken over from the grundverb Sub V, which is indeed not unlikely in the case of *räk*[(ä)]*-*, because its grundverb seems to have had persistent -*ā-* as root vowel in both Sub V and Pt I.

For the forms with a root vowel PT *(')ä, see the next paragraph.

19.1.5.   *Root-initial palatalization*

As should be expected from PIE thematic root presents, Sub II forms with a root vowel *ä almost always show root-initial palatalization.[4]

---

[3] For the ablaut of the Sub II from *käm-* 'come', which also shows another alternation, see below 19.2.

There is, however, one quite remarkable exception, viz. the Sub II from *wik*[(a)]- Antigv. 'avoid', which shows root-initial *w-* instead of *y-*, thereby pointing to a pre-PT proto-form *u̯ig/k-e-ti. It is quite striking that both of the two PIE roots that could provide an etymon (for which see s.v. *wik*[(a)]-) had a zero-grade thematic present of the so-called *tudáti* type in Indo-Iranian (for the evidence see now Hill, 2007, 231ff.).

19.2. Diachronic Treatment

A Tocharian thematic subjunctive can obviously continue a PIE thematic present stem formation, as is apparent from examples such as PT Sub II *pāsk'ä/skæ- < PIE *ph₂-sk̂e/o-; see, e.g., Lane, 1959, 163ff. In addition, origin from PIE root aorist subjunctives has also been claimed for some Sub II stems, most notably that from *käm-/ [A]*kum-* 'come'; see Ringe, 2000, 131ff.; Kim, 2001, 123; 2007, 189f. Note, however, that the related Priv *ekamätte* cannot derive from a PIE stem *g̯em-e/o- and obviously presupposes an athematic Class I subjunctive, as per Hilmarsson, 1991, 105f., who, however, in Hilmarsson, 1996, 73 himself also advocated derivation of the apparent Sub II forms from the PIE root aorist subjunctive *g̯em-e/o-, while deriving the athematic Sub I stem from a PIE perfect form. To be sure, the obvious solution is rather to start with one single, of course both ablauting and (already for this reason) athematic pre-PT root formation, which then could only have been a present built by the *tēzzi* principle on the non-Narten root aorist PIE *g̯em-t (> pre-PT *g̯e[m]n-t), *g̯m-ent.[5] One has then only further to assume that the Sub forms of that root that look like typical Sub II forms such as *śanmem̐* are due to rather recent analogical innovation. Other (possible) Sub II forms have also been claimed to derive from PIE subjunctives to root aorists rather than from PIE thematic presents, see Hackstein, 1995, 241 on *kantär* (which, however, may rather be a Sub I, as correctly pointed out by Hackstein himself) and see furthermore Hackstein, 1995, 243f. with respect to the Sub II from *lut-* 'remove', and Kim, 2007, 190 for the Sub II forms from *pälk*[(a)]- Antigv./ [A]*pälk*[(a)?]-

---

[4] The forms from *tsärk-* 'burn' and *pälk*[(a)]- Antigv. 'burn' are, of course, ambiguous with respect to palatalization, and in the case of *tsäm*[(a)]- Antigv. 'increase' it is even doubtful that the forms belong to a Sub II at all.

[5] Pre-PT *g̯e[m]n-t can also neatly explain the Sub II stem allomorph *śänm-* that Peyrot, 2008, 147 showed is already attested in archaic texts.

'burn', *luk*(a)- Antigv. 'illuminate', and *wik*(a)- Antigv. 'avoid'. Although it is certainly true that all of the respective PIE roots may have formed (athematic) root aorists in PIE times and therefore also *e*-grade thematic root subjunctives,[6] there is nothing wrong with assuming that pre-PT had behaved precisely like Greek, where we find many *e*-grade thematic root presents such as τρέφομαι standing beside thematic root aorists such as ἔτραφε and aorists in -η- such as ἐτράφη, which no doubt replaced older athematic root aorists. Of course, one can claim that the Greek τρέφομαι presents had started out as subjunctives themselves, but as a matter of fact they function as present indicatives only right from their first attestations. Accordingly, in my view not any Sub II form is apt to prove or even just to suggest that PIE subjunctive forms could be preserved into (pre-)PT and could even do so while retaining their original function.

---

[6] This implies, of course, that precisely the Sub II from *wik*(a)- Antigv. 'avoid', which does not go back to an *e*-grade formation, is not to be derived from such a kind of subjunctive at all.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE OF CLASS III

20.1.   SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT SUBJUNCTIVE CLASS III

The Class III subjunctive is an unproductive stem formation. It is only attested from nine roots, all of which seem to lack A-character. Formally, the inflection of subjunctive Class III is identical with that of present Class III: both show the same suffix -e-/TA -a-, both are medium tantum, and while it is only merely the majority among the Class III presents that has -ä- as root vowel, such a restriction to -ä- holds even without exception for all regular Class III subjunctives. Both classes, however, differ with respect to their paradigmatic affiliation. Present Class III is only attested from roots with A-character, and therefore associated with ā-subjunctives and ā-preterits. In contrast, subjunctives of Class III are paradigmatically associated with Class I subjunctives, and actually function (with one secondary exception) as oppositional intransitives to such transitive active Class I subjunctives in verbal paradigms from typical causative alternation verbs (on which see chap. Valency 4.7.2. in detail).

The following nine roots form a subjunctive of Class III (8 TB, 7 TA, 6 TB = TA):

kän(ä)*-/ ^Akän-* act. 'fulfil', mid. 'come about, occur', *käs-/ ^Akäs-* act. 'quench, extinguish', mid. 'come to extinction', *täm-/ ^Atäm-* act. 'beget', mid. 'be born, come into being', *näk-/ ^Anäk-* act. 'destroy, lose', mid. 'fall into ruin, disappear', *näm-* act. 'bend', mid. 'bow', *päk-/ ^Apäk-* act. 'cook, let ripen', mid. 'cook, ripen', *ru-* act. 'open (tr)', mid. 'open (itr)',[1] *^Awäl-* 'die', *tsäk-/ ^Atsäk-* act. 'burn (tr)', mid. 'burn (itr)'.

The following forms are attested:

---

[1] Although there is only the middle Opt *ruwyentär* attested beside the active, transitive Sub I stem, which on the surface looks like the respective middle Opt of this Sub I stem (and accordingly was analyzed as Sub I stem formation by the manuals), from a synchronic point of view the form belongs to a Sub III stem. Accordingly, I analyze it as such, although it will be argued below that from a diachronic point of view, such middle Opt forms beside Sub III stems are indeed nothing but old Sub I stem formations.

	TB	TA
1.sg.mid.	*ksemar, cmemar, nkemar, tskemar*	—
2.sg.mid.	*cmetar*	*nkatār*
3.sg.mid.	*knetär, cmetär, nketär, nmetär*	*knatär, cmatär, nkatär, wlatär*
1.pl.mid.	—	*wlamtär*
2.pl.mid.	—	—
3.pl.mid.	*ksentär, cmentär, nmentär*	*nkantr-äṃ*
Ger	*knelle, kselle, cmelle, nkelle, tsäkelle*	*cmal, pkal/p ̯ukal, wlal*
Abs	*knelñe, kselñe, cmelñe, nkelñe, pkelñe, tskelñe*	*knalune, ksalune, cmalune, nkalune, pkalune/p ̯ukalune, wlalune, tskalune*
Inf	*ksetsi, cmetsi, nketsi, ñmetsi, tsketsi*	

20.1.1.   *The root vowel*

Class III subjunctives have *-ä-* as root vowel, which caused initial palatalization in the case of *täm-* → *cme-*/ TA *cma-*, but not with other roots with palatalizable root initial (*kän⁽ᵃ⁾-, käs-, näk-*), except in the Inf variant *ñmetsi.* Since *ñmetsi* is attested in 335 a 5, a manuscript in common archaic ductus (see Malzahn, 2007a, 264), the scribe of which further seems to have been quite keen on using archaisms,[2] it is likely that *ñmetsi* is also an archaism. Consequently, one may toy with the idea that originally even more, or maybe all, of the Class III subjunctives had a palatalizing *-ä-*, i.e., a pre-PT *e*-grade, and that analogical depalatalization had occurred in quite a number or even in all of the cases (as already suggested by Jasanoff, 1978, 37).

20.1.2.   *The optative*

Optatives associated with Class III subjunctives are in theory formally indistinguishable from optatives derived from a Class I subjunctive stem, because the optative suffix *-i-* descriptively replaces the stem-final *-e-*/ TA *-a-* of Class III, and even an ablauting Sub I stem had the

---

[2] The scribe sometimes made a mistake, e.g., when using hypercorrect *träṅkä* (334 a 1) instead of the correct *o*-stem *träṅko.* A palatalized Inf *ñmetsi,* however, can hardly be a hypercorrect form (on what model?), and should therefore be taken for an archaism.

same *ä*-grade in the optative we find in Sub III. In addition, both kinds of optatives show root-final palatalization in front of the optative morpheme (if possible), with the noticeable exception of TA *knitär* (for which see immediately below).

Class I Opt	Class III Opt	
TB	TB	TA
ruwim	*kñitär/käñiyoytär/kñyoytar, cmīmar,*	*knitär,*
	cmītär, näśītär/nśītär, ruwyentär, tsśītär,	*nśitär*
	tsśitär	

As for the eastern TB optative variants 3.sg. *käñiyoytär* and 3.sg. *kñyoytar* (sic) standing beside the regular 3.sg. Opt *kñitär*, Hackstein, 1995, 237, fn. 93 suggests that they are secondary formations that owe the attachment of the optative suffix *-oy-* to the stem *kñi-* to analogy with optative forms from Sub V stems made from other roots such as "*käsk-oy-tär, tsm-oy-tär*", whereas Peters, 2006, 334f., fn. 16 assumes that these forms are blends of *kñitär* with an *ā*-stem optative **knoy-* from this same root. Since 1.sg.mid. Sub *kyānamar* attested in the eastern variety of Tocharian B also precisely is an *ā*-stem variant of the subjunctive, and since the non-palatalized TA *knitär* may also owe its non-palatalized root final to the existence of an *ā*-stem, Peters sets up a Sub V **känā-*, deriving it from PIE Narten root aorist **ĝenh$_1$-to* (while assuming analogical depalatalization of the root initial).

In Tocharian B, a palatalizable root final is in general always palatalized before the optative suffix *-ĭ-*. In Tocharian A, the two attested intransitive Class III optatives differ with respect to palatalization: TA *knitär* from *A*kän- 'come about' has an unpalatalized root final, whereas TA *nśitär* from *A*näk- 'fall into ruin' shows a palatalized root final before the optative suffix TA *-i-*. As is argued in chap. Opt, the TA optative suffix TA *-i-* certainly had palatalizing quality (just like in Tocharian B), and the regular lack of palatalization before TA *-i-* in the optatives from subjunctive stems in (*)-*ā*- is owed to an analogical innovation. Accordingly, palatalized TA *nśitär* is the regular form, while TA *knitär* either belongs to a Sub V in the first place, or shows influence of an optative from a Sub V built from the same PIE seṭ root **√ĝenh$_1$* as the eastern TB Opt *käñiyoytär* and *kñyoytar*, as per Peters, 2006, 334f., fn. 16.

Note that we are facing here another crucial difference between Class III subjunctives and Class III presents: while the former build optatives which regularly have a palatalized consonant before the *-i*-morpheme, Class III presents behave irregularly with respect to

imperfects in both languages. In Tocharian A, no special imperfect forms are formed at all from this present class (the forms are supplied by the preterit), while in Tocharian B the imperfects show irregular lack of palatalization (see chap. Prs III/IV for details).

20.1.3.   *Function*

As already stated above, the Class III subjunctives have a clearly defined function within the Tocharian verbal system: they serve as intransitive subjunctive stems standing in opposition to (possibly active-only) transitive Sub I stems[3] of verbs that seem to be typical causative alternation verbs, i.e., unaccusatives of the type *break*. As for the related present and preterit stems provided by Prs VIII and Pt III, there is no change of stem formation in Tocharian B, the causative alternation in both the respective present and preterit being expressed by mere voice alternation.

There are no certain cases of a synchronic variation of Class III subjunctives with respective Class I middle forms (although such a variation can at least be argued diachronically, see below); the only possible example may be the 3.sg.mid. *k(a)ntär-ñ* (MQ) (or: *kantär ñi*), which is certainly a middle of Sub Class I (or II). Hackstein, 1995, 232f. argues that the form is most likely intransitive, basing his claim on the restoration by TochSprR(B) *(akāl)k k(a)ntär-ñ* "Möge mir der Wunsch in Erfüllung gehen" (or in the case of *ñ(i)*: "may my wish come true"). But since the passage is otherwise fragmentary, one cannot be sure about the valency, i.e., transitive "may (s)he fulfill my wish" cannot be excluded, although this would be the first example of a transitive use of a middle Sub I standing beside a Sub III (in case *kantär* is not rather Sub II indeed).[4]

Any diachronic theory on subjunctive Class III must explain why this stem formation functions as the middle-only intransitive counterpart to (possibly) active-only transitives instead, and maybe beside, subjunctive Class I middle forms.

---

[3] With the one exception of TA *wla-* 'die', which most likely owed its *-a-* merely to its antonym TA *cma-* 'be born'.

[4] One would further wish the restoration of a transitive, active 2.pl. Sub I *akālk ka[n](cer)* in 81 b 1 (as per Hackstein, 1995, 236) to be correct, but, as Hackstein himself concludes, one cannot be sure about that. A look at the photograph of the manuscript does not give any clue to the correct restoration other than that the last sign is indeed a ⟨na⟩ and not a fremdzeichen ⟨na⟩.

20.2. DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

Subjunctive Class III is a highly recessive class. But then, it is practically the only Tocharian verbal class made from roots that almost all have a clear PIE etymology. Traditionally, it is assumed that the class shows a generalized, or at any rate persistent, PIE thematic suffix vowel *-o-, cf. VW II/2, 217.

Jasanoff, 1975, 107ff. (cf. also 1978, 36f.; 1987, 101f.) noted that no less than six subjunctive Class III verbs are cognate to a thematic middle in Indo-Iranian: *kän⁽ᵃ⁾-*: Ved. *jánate* (cf. also Lat. *genitur*); *käs-*: Ved. **jásate* (in Ved. *jásamāna-*); *näk-*: Ved. *náśate* (but taken for a subjunctive in 1978, 36, fn. 22); *näm-*: Ved. *námate*; *päk-*: Ved. *pácate*; *tsäk-*: Ved. *dáhate.*

Hence he concluded that the Tocharian class should be derived from such thematic middles, which had persistent stem-final *-o- in the whole paradigm, probably due to the analogical influence of a bare ending *-o(r), which was also his explanation at the time (1975) for the Class III(/IV) presents.[5] Later, however, Jasanoff, 1998, 311, fn. 45, and 2003, 201f. rather opined that "[t]he thematic conjugation had no particular affinity for the middle in the parent language; indeed, the thematic stems *$pék^u$-e/o-* 'cook', *$g^ués$-e/o-* 'extinguish', and *$\hat{g}énh_1$-e/o-* 'beget', seem specifically to have been active and transitive, with contrasting intransitive stems *$pék^u$-i̯e/o-*, *$g^ués$-i̯e/o-*, and *$\hat{g}n̥h_1$-i̯é/ó-* beside them". Therefore, Jasanoff, 1998, 310f., 2003, 202f., and most recently 2008, 159ff. derives the class now from presigmatic aorist middle forms such as *$ne\hat{k}$-o, which emerged as a result of paradigmatic leveling (*$nó\hat{k}$-o/*$né\hat{k}$-ro → *$nó\hat{k}$-o (> *$nó\hat{k}$-to)/*$nó\hat{k}$-ro on the one hand, *$né\hat{k}$-or on the other).[6]

Generalization of an "intransitive middle ending *-*o*" preserved in the Class III subjunctive was also assumed by Kortlandt, 1984 = 2007, 68 and by Rasmussen, 1990, 189, fn. 2, deriving the Sub III of *käs-* 'quench' from a PIE root aorist subjunctive (but differently, Rasmussen, 2002, see below).

Ringe, 1991, 84 claimed that *camel* and TA *cmol* 'birth' are based on the subjunctive Class III stem of the root, and thereby prove that *-e-/*

---

[5] However, Jasanoff changed his mind about the Class III and IV presents already as early as in 1978; see the discussion in chap. Prs III/IV.

[6] Cf. also Jasanoff, 1994a, 151, fn. 5, where the Class III subjunctives are called "formally thematic middles with persistent *o*-color of the thematic vowel" on the one hand, but *-otor is said to represent "earlier *-or, which contrasted with *-etor" on the other hand.

TA -*a*- of Sub III cannot go back to PIE *o > pre-PT *o, because according to him TA -*o*- in TA *cmol* is due to labial rounding by a preceding *m*, and such labial rounding he further claimed did not affect the usual outcome of PIE = pre-PT *o. However, TA *cmol* rather goes back to a pre-PT stem in *-olu- or *-ēlu-, TA -*o*- here being due to *u*-umlaut, see Hilmarsson, 1986, 27, 165, 174, and 212.

Adams, 1994, 23ff. based the subjunctive Class III on thematic PIE zero-grade 3.sg. middle forms with a h_2e-conjugation present ending *-o to which productive *-tor was added, which is somewhat reminiscent of Jasanoff's explanation.

Kümmel, apud ²LIV, 164, fn. 15 (s.v. *√ĝenh₁), 453, fn. 4 (s.v. *√nem), and 624, fn. 4 (s.v. *√tem) proposes that the -*e*- of the Class III subjunctives *knetär*, *nmetär*, and *cmetär* is to be derived from the PIE subjunctive morpheme *-ē- which showed up in the 2./3.sg. and 2.pl. of subjunctives to thematic indicatives, whereas for *kantär* he follows the derivation by Hackstein, 1995 from the subjunctive in PIE *-e(/o)- of the root aorist. Kümmel is followed by Rasmussen 2002, 381f., who sees further support for this theory in the fact that the roots having a Sub III in Tocharian show precisely thematic presents in other IE languages (but see now the objections by Jasanoff, 2003, 201f.). As for the lack of root-final palatalization (which should, of course, be expected if the class is to be derived from subjunctive stems in *-ē- belonging to thematic indicatives), Rasmussen claims analogical depalatalization in a "plainly recessive" morphological category; actually Rasmussen assumes that Prs III has an -*e*- that is to be derived from *-eh₁-i̯e/o- and hence shows depalatalization as well. He obviously thinks that non-palatalizing *-æ- had spread from Class IV presents such as *orotär*, which he wants to derive from pre-PT *aro-tor. Hackstein, 2004, 89, fn. 14 objects to Kümmel and Rasmussen that it would be better to derive Class III subjunctives and Class III presents from one common source, and this common source can hardly have been a thematic formation, by arguing: "Von thematischen Stämmen abgeleitete Optative zeigen Palatalisierung des Wurzelauslauts [...], während dieselbe bei Prs. III und Konj. III ausbleibt."

Finally, Peters, 2006, 334f., fn. 16 claims that the Class III subjunctives must have started out as Class I subjunctives for various structural reasons, and that forms of the Sub I *näkätär type finally underwent some kind of morphological dissimilation, so that forms of the most unwelcome structure *CV$_i$CV$_i$CV$_i$- could in the end be avoided. According to him, both a single PT "*käno₂tär" > *knetär* (the

result of a blend of a *känātär with *känätär) and also later Prs III forms such as PT "*tsämo₂tär" 'grows' could have provided the model for such a morphological change. Peters also claims that Sub III forms and middle Sub I forms show complementary distribution, the Sub III forms having always, and the middle Sub I forms having never, an overt shape of the root CäC-; for the latter type, see, e.g., Sub I *kutär*, which acts as a passive of a transitive active Sub I *kewu* 'I pour' (see already Adams, 1994, 24, fn. 46: "Only *kew-/ku-* 'pour' is exceptional in having a middle in *ku-* rather than in *käwé-*").

To be sure, a complementary distribution such as claimed by Peters does not exist, because there are indeed some middle forms attested with an overt root structure CäC-: beside the one already adduced by Peters himself, i.e., *k(a)ntär(-ñ)*, which is unclear with respect to function, there can now be cited other examples of such Sub I middles from unpublished texts (which were, of course, unavailable to Peters, 2006): *piltär* from *päl-* 'listen closely' (if not a Sub II) and *wastär* from *wäs-* 'don, wear (clothes)'. Still, I think that Peters' claim that middle Sub III forms are merely due to a recent reshaping of middle Sub I forms is basically correct, and that the phonological aspect invoked by him did indeed play a part in that alleged transformation. However, the trigger for that transformation could not have merely been an urge to avoid structures of the type *CV$_i$CV$_i$CV$_i$- (otherwise we hardly would have a form like *wastär*), but there must have been an additional factor, and as far as I can see this can only have been function. Peters is silent about the remarkable fact that *kutär*, which according to him may have escaped the change because *käwä-tär had been contracted to *ku-tär* before the reshaping took place, is, in fact, a passive, while the Sub III forms showing the replacement advocated by him are without exception oppositional middles in anticausative function. Consequently, I think *wastär* and *p'ältär (> *piltär*) escaped a transformation into Sub III forms precisely for the reason that they were clearly not oppositional middles in anticausative function either. Hence, I suggest that middle Sub I forms with a root shape CäC- indeed underwent the transformation suggested by Peters, but probably only if they formed the intransitive part of causative alternation pairs.

On the other hand, there are reasons to believe that Sub I stems formerly indeed could show valency alternation by mere voice alternation, i.e., have intransitive middles in anticausative function, and this evidence comes from roots with A-character that form a subjunctive of Class I as antigrundverb stem formation. It is true that the antigrundverb is generally an oppositional transitive paradigm,

but nevertheless its stems can also show causative alternation themselves (in this case, the middle intransitive of the antigrundverb has a different meaning from the intransitive grundverb, see chap. Valency 4.5.1.). A diagnostic case I think is *si-n-* mid. 'satiate oneself', 'be depressed'/ *Asi-n-* act. 'satiate', mid. 'satiate oneself', 'be depressed', where we have a middle, intransitive Sub VII TA *siñantär* that is certainly just a substitute of an old Sub I actually still preserved in the Priv TA *asinät* (and the TB Abstr *silñe*).

Moreover, assuming that middle Sub I forms could act as intransitive members of causative alternation pairs, and that precisely such middle forms could undergo some morphological reshaping, is also recommended by a more general reasoning. There can be no doubt that the principle "causative alternation by voice alternation" had been inherited from PIE into pre-PT, because we find this principle still applied in a certain number of other morphological categories of historical Tocharian, see chap. Valency 4.7.2. However, as is discussed there in detail the speakers of Tocharian evidently preferred to denote difference in valency in a morphologically more redundant way. Accordingly, a transformation of middle Sub I forms functioning as anticausatives into morphologically more complex forms would have been fully in line with a general tendency of Tocharian to rather express valency difference by stem alternation. As a parallel one could even point out the fact that, e.g., in Tocharian A oppositional middle forms of Prs VIII (such as still preserved in Tocharian B) were obviously just secondarily replaced by those of the more complex Prs X in the cases of the two roots *Anäk-* 'destroy, lose; fall into ruin, disappear' and *Apäk-* 'cook (tr), let ripen; cook (itr), ripen'.

From a diachronic perspective, only the solutions put forth by Adams, 1994; Jasanoff, 2003; and Peters, 2006[7] take into account, and can account somehow for, the function of Sub Class III and its position within the system.[8]

---

[7] Peters' explanation could even be improved by pointing out that a Sub V PT *tsämätär is best taken for a blend of an active *tēzzi*-type present *tsämä- with a middle *tēzzi*-type present *tsämätär, and that therefore, according to Peters' system, once there may have existed a variation *tsämätär ~ "*tsämo$_2$tär", which then could have triggered a new variation *näkätär vs. "*näko$_2$tär" quite easily.

[8] If we were simply dealing with normal thematic presents (or subjunctives), i.e., stems going back to *-e/o- inflection, there would be no motivation to be found for why these thematic stems should have generalized

As for the cases of root-initial palatalization found in some Sub III forms, at least within the framework of Peters they would only reflect root-specific pre-PT *e*-grades once existing in respective middle root aorists (i.e., in those that according to Peters provided the basis for the respective former middle Sub I forms). It is indeed quite striking that the root that denotes 'be born' in Tocharian shows quite consistently *c*- from *t'*- in this morphological category, and actually many people reconstruct a middle Narten root aorist for the root 'be born' in PIE, viz. a *ĝenh₁-to from *√ĝenh₁.

---

*-o-, while at the same time being restricted to middle inflection and intransitive valency (generalization of -a- in the Gothic middle could not provide a plausible parallel, because according to Cowgill, 1985b, 145ff. = 2006, 441ff. it was due to the moribund function of that class, and although Toch. Sub III is also a rare kind of stem formation, the formation of oppositional middles itself was certainly nothing rare in Tocharian at all); further, the existence of active (synchronic) Prs II *keṣäṃ* 'quench' vs. middle Prs II *keṣträ* 'come to extinction' or active Sub II *lyutem* 'remove, expel' vs. middle Sub II *lyutätär* 'go out (from), leave' in addition shows that Tocharian at least occasionally preserved causative alternation by voice alternation in simple thematic paradigms.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE OF CLASS IV

21.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT SUBJUNCTIVE CLASS IV

Only seven roots form a subjunctive of Class IV, and only one example can be found in Tocharian A at all:

ākl-/ ᴬākl- 'learn', *auks-* 'grow, increase', *kärś-* 'chop up', *kälyp-* 'steal', *lāl-* 'exert oneself', *wäs-* 'dwell, lie down', *śer-* 'hunt'.

The following forms are attested:

	TB	TA
1.sg.act.	*lalyyau, wṣiyau*	—
2.sg.act.	—	—
3.sg.act.	*kärśi-ñ, wṣi-ñä*	—
1.pl.act.	—	—
2.pl.act.	—	—
3.pl.act.	*kärśye-ñ* (sic), *wṣiyeṃ*	—
1.sg.mid.	—	—
2.sg.mid.	—	—
3.sg.mid.	*aklyitär*	—
1.pl.mid.	—	—
2.pl.mid.	—	—
3.pl.mid.	—	—
Ger/Abs	*aklyilñe, wṣille, wṣīlñe*	*āklyuneyā*
Inf	*aklyitsi, aukṣitsi, kälypītsi, lalyitsi, wṣītsi, śerītsi*	

A TA example of this class was yet unknown to the manuals, so that it was consequently regarded as an inner-TB innovation. The newly attested TA form *āklyuneyā* found in the YQ manuscript (see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 124), now presupposes an abstract *ākälyune, i.e., an *i*-subjunctive stem from *ᴬākl-* 'learn' matching the TB Sub IV stem *āklyi-*. The analysis and restoration of the Sub IV stem form *aukṣi* //// in THT 1175 a 2 is uncertain.

A subjunctive of Class IV is always correlated with a present of Class IXa and with a preterit of Class VII (if present and preterit forms are attested at all); on the alleged exception *ālyi-* from *āl⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv.

'keep away' (which is, in my opinion, no Sub IV stem at all), see below 21.1.1.

As in every sequence -*iyV*-, the -*i*- (from what seems to be accented *á) can be deleted in metrical passages and in that case the form is written as if the deleted vowel would still bear the accent, as is usual with this kind of schwa deletion (see in general Winter, 1990, 371ff. = 2005, 393ff.), cf., e.g., 1.sg. *lalyyau*, 3.pl. *kärśye-ñ*.

21.1.1.   *Optative vs. subjunctive, and the problem of* ālyinträ

The 3.pl.mid. Opt *aklyiyentär* from *ākl*- 'learn' and the 3.sg.act. Opt *kalypi* and 1.pl.act. Opt *kälypiyem* from *kälyp*- 'steal' are the only certain optative forms made from a Class IV subjunctive stem.[1] Based on the evidence of these forms the older manuals claimed that subjunctive forms and optative forms in this stem class are homomorphous. This view was challenged by Schmidt, 1975, 291f., who claimed that the 3.pl. *ālyinträ* in 255 b 7 (MQ) is a subjunctive form of *āl*[(a)]- Antigv. 'keep away' and not an optative form as was the analysis of the manuals, and that consequently, at least in the 3.pl.mid., one would have to do with a subjunctive ending -*intär* being different from an optative ending -*iyentär*. Schmidt's view was subsequently generally followed (e.g., by Van Windekens, VW II/2, 224).[2]

Schmidt's analysis of *ālyinträ* as subjunctive and hence Class IV formation is based on the judgment of Krause, WTG, 121f., § 120, fn. 5 that this form would as a 3.pl. optative be "gänzlich isoliert". I have, however, several objections to Schmidt's analysis, whereas there are good arguments for the traditional analysis of *ālyinträ* as an optative form based on a Class I subjunctive stem. First, I do not see how *ālyinträ* can be a "regelrechte 3. Pl. Med. des *i*-Konjunktivs", i.e., what seems an athematic form, because all other attestations of Sub IV are certainly thematic, and Schmidt does not elaborate on the point. Second, a Class IV subjunctive made from *āl*[(a)]- in the meaning 'keep

---

[1] Pace WTG, 231, the 3.pl. *kärśye-ñ* in 220 b 4 (MQ) is a subjunctive not an optative; see Hilmarsson, 1996, 94. There is now even a second form attested from this subjunctive stem, the 3.sg. *kärśi-ñ* in PK AS 16.7 b 1 (a non-MQ text; G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), and this is also a subjunctive.

[2] To be sure, Hilmarsson, 1991, 86, fn. 68 points out that the alleged distinction between a 3.pl. Opt ending -*iyentär* and 3.pl. Sub ending -*intär* may just be "secondary".

away' would be highly irregular with respect to the other verbal forms attested for the antigrundverb or kausativum paradigms from this root.[3] No other Sub IV stem belongs to an antigrundverb or kausativum. Third, as 3.pl. optative of a Sub I stem *ālyinträ* is not as isolated as it seems, because *-intär* is exactly what we would expect as an old 3.pl.mid. optative ending in the first place, since optatives are basically inflected athematically (and *-int-* may even be the lautgesetzlich outcome of PIE *-ih$_1$-n̥t- > *-äi̯än-). As for Schmidt's claim that the form has to be a subjunctive because the following verbal form is a subjunctive, I do not find this a compelling argument, because Schmidt himself admits that the passage in question is "im einzelnen unklar" (as are, to be sure, most passages of this document). Finally, from the very same paradigm an Inf *āltsi* is attested three times, and this form attests to an athematic Class I subjunctive stem beyond doubt,[4] and a Class I stem is further presupposed by the Sub VII in Tocharian A (see chap. Sub VII). Hence, I will follow the traditional analysis of *ālyinträ* as optative of Sub I (see now also Kim, 2007a, 51, fn. 8).

---

[3] On the other hand, a subjunctive stem of Class I is perfectly expected in an antigrundverb paradigm. Tocharian A only has what is certainly the antigrundverb paradigm (VIII/VII/III), a likewise antigrundverb stem formation is attested in TB by the PPt *ālu* (belonging to a Pt III). As for the present stem, Schmidt points out that we have to set up a Prs IXa on the evidence of *alaṣṣälle*, which would indeed go well together with a Sub IV. However, we also have the present stem forms *aläṣṣeñca* in 245 a 2 (MQ) (cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1974, 216) beside 317 a 2 *[a]laṣṣä[ll]e* (MQ). *(a)l(astär)* in KVāc 17 a 3 may be a restored form, but it cannot be restored to †*al(ästär)*. As is argued in chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.4., *aläṣṣeñca* can be neatly explained as a normal Prs IXb form with loss of A-character, whereas the MQ form *[a]laṣṣä[ll]e* can be an archaism showing preservation of A-character. In contrast, loss of A-character in Prs IXa is only attested with very few forms. In that case, one will rather restore to *(ā)l(astär)* in KVāc 17 a 3.

[4] Although all three attestations come from metrical passages, I doubt that we can assume metrical schwa deletion, because no other Sub IV shows such a deletion of *-i-* in the infinitive, and *-i-* goes certainly back to *-äy-. Hilmarsson, 1991, 87f. also analyzed the Inf *āltsi* as a Sub I form, but did so under the assumption that a Sub I stem could have an optative of Class IV beside it, because he claimed that the Class IV subjunctives are derived from optatives made to athematic stems in the first place, but see my discussion below in the main text.

21.2.   DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

There are basically two different diachronic approaches for the Class IV subjunctives: deriving them from optatives in *-ih$_1$- and from present stems in *-i̯e/o-.

Lane, 1959, 166, who was followed, among others,[5] by Hilmarsson, 1991, 86f.; 1994, 47, claimed that we may simply be dealing with optatives in *-ī- used in subjunctive function, but this would be quite exceptional in Tocharian, because inherited optatives either remained optatives in Tocharian or came to be used as imperfects (or maybe even preterits); note that in general Tocharian subjunctives rather derive from pre-PT present indicative forms. In order to back his idea, Hilmarsson, 1991, 86ff. adduced the Priv *alalätte* 'relentless, indefatiguable' pointing to the former existence of a Sub I stem made from that root. This evidence, however, is not apt to prove that the Sub IV class consists of optatives derived from Class I subjunctives; it simply shows that a Sub IV could have coexisted with a Sub I.

On the other hand, Adams, 1988a, 72; Winter, 1990, 377 = 2005, 399; Hackstein, 1995, 219f.; Ringe, 1996, 53ff.; Kim, 2007a, 50f.; and Pinault, 2008, 588 derive the Class IV subjunctives from *i̯e/o*-presents, from both deverbative ones and denominative ones. These authors, however, sometimes disagree about which Sub IV should be regarded as deverbative and which as denominative in the first place. For instances, Winter, 1990, 377 = 2005, 399 took *aklyi-* and *lalyi-* for denominatives, Hackstein, 1995, 219f. only accepted *aklyi-* and *śerī-* as such, and Ringe, 1996, 53ff. did so only with *śerī-*, which according to him is a clear denominative from *śer(u)we* 'hunter'[6] from pre-PT *kēru̯e-i̯e/o-, whereas *aklyi-* and *lalyi-* he wrote are just "conceivably" denominatives on the evidence of the nouns *akalye* 'doctrine' and *lalyiye* 'effort'. To be sure, Ringe further noted that the PPts *āklu* and *lalālu* rather suggest that it is the nouns in *-iye* that are derived from

---

[5] For instances, also Van Windekens (VW II/2, 224). Since most of the Pt VII forms obviously go together with Sub IV forms, whoever would like to derive the Class VII *iyā*-preterits from optative > preterit forms in PIE *-ih$_1$- should as a consequence derive the Class IV *i*-subjunctives from such optative forms as well; accordingly, it is somewhat strange that Kim, 2003, 194, fn. 6 wants to derive the Pt VII forms from optatives, but the Sub IV forms from *i̯e/o*-presents (thus Kim, 2007a, 50ff.).

[6] Note that according to Pinault, 2006b, 179ff., this noun is a loan from an Iranian source (accepted by Cheung, 2007, 338 s.v. *saru̯), and the verb accordingly a rather recent inner-Tocharian creation.

the verb (as per Schmidt, 1975, 292, fn. 18; see now also Kim, 2007a, 52).

As for *aklyi-*, note that by following the derivation of (*)*akl(ä)-* with non-palatalized *-l-* from *ō-k̂lu-* 'listen to' suggested by Schmidt, 1992, 112; 1997c, 545f. and Hilmarsson, 1996, 9, one could simply start with an *e*-grade thematic present pre-PT *ō-kleu̯-e/o-, which would have precisely to result in PT *ākl'äw'ä- > pre-TB *ākl'äyä-, and eventually TB *aklyi-*. On the other hand, note also that by deriving the majority of Sub IV forms from *i̯e/o*-presents, one could not only equate the Sub IV from *kälyp-* 'steal' with κλέπτω 'steal' (cf. Kim, 2007a, 52), but also that from *wäs-* 'dwell' with ἰαύω 'pass the night' (of course, with the exception of the reduplication syllable found in the Greek verb).

As for the latter strategy, it seems to be basically adopted also by Klingenschmitt, 1994, 407 = 2005, 432, fn. 165, but in a very special way; according to him, at least the Sub IV from *wäs-* derives from a denominative in *-ih₂-i̯e/o-, viz. *h₂us-ih₂-i̯e/o-. Interestingly enough, he then claimed this resulted in "*u̯äs'i̯i̯ä/a-", and not in a proto-form with *-īy-, as one might have guessed in the first place. At any rate, *h₂us-i̯e/o- would be a much more obvious choice, according to what was argued above, and see also Kim, 2007a, 52.

To sum up, deriving Sub IV from optatives would not make much sense with respect to morphosyntactics; on the other hand, deriving the class basically from *i̯e/o*-presents as far as I can see would only have advantages and no drawbacks; as for surfacing -CĭC- < *-C'äyC-, one may suggest a metathesis PT *-Cy'äC(-) > *-C'äyC(-) (differently Kim, 2007a, 52).

THE SUBJUNCTIVE OF CLASS VII

22.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT SUBJUNCTIVE CLASS VII

The subjunctive of Class VII characterized by a thematically inflected suffix TA -*ñ*- is only productive in Tocharian A. However, the TB subjunctive stems of *lä-n-t-* 'go out' and *we-ñ-* 'speak' are usually compared with this TA subjunctive class by the manuals as well (cf. TEB I, 231, § 415). The following 21 TA verbs form a subjunctive of Class VII:

^A*ar-* 'evoke, bring forth', ^A*āl^{(a)?}-* 'keep away, hold in check', ^A*en-* 'advice', ^A*ok-* '± set in motion', ^A*o(-n)-* mid. 'begin', ^A*kärk-* 'bind', ^A*ku-* 'pour, offer a libation', ^A*kläṅk^{(a)?}-* Antigv. 'doubt', ^A*täṅk-* 'hinder', ^A*träṅk-* 'cling, stick', ^A*nāk-* 'blame', ^A*yāt^(a)-* Antigv. 'enable, tame', ^A*ri(-n)-* 'leave, give up', ^A*läṅk-* Antigv. 'let dangle', ^A*lip^(a)-* Antigv. 'leave (behind)', ^A*lut-* 'remove', ^A*wāk^(a)-* Antigv. act. 'take apart', mid. 'differ', ^A*ṣärp-* 'indicate, explain, instruct', ^A*sāk^(a)-* Antigv. 'restrain', ^A*si-n-* act. 'satiate', mid. 'satiate oneself, be depressed', ^A*se-* 'support'. Uncertain is: ^A*ār^(a)-* 'cease' (3.sg. TA *aräñtar*, sic). Special cases are: ^{AB}*we-ñ-* 'say, speak' and ^{AB}*lä-n-t-* 'go out'.

The following TA Sub VII forms (including ^A*we-ñ-*) are attested:

1.sg.act.	*kärkñam, lyutñam, wākñam, weñam, señmār*
2.sg.act.	*lipñät-ñi*
3.sg.act.	*okñäṣ, kärkñäṣ, täṅkñäṣ, wākñäṣ, weñäṣ*
1.pl.act.	—
2.pl.act.	—
3.pl.act.	*weñeñc*
1.sg.mid.	*yātñmār, riñmār, señmār*
2.sg.mid.	*nākäñtār, riñtār*
3.sg.mid.	*aräñtar, nākäñtär, oñtar*
1.pl.mid.	—
2.pl.mid.	*riñcär*
3.pl.mid.	*arñantar, nākñantär, siñantär*
Ger	*arñäl, ālñäl, träṅkñäl, yātñal* (sic), *riñäl, weñl-äṃ, siñäl*
Abs	*eñlune, riñlune, kuñlune, weñlune, siñlune*

The Sub VII is discussed in detail by Hilmarsson, 1991a, 66ff. The only morphologically problematic TA Sub VII form is the Ger II TA *yātñal*

for expected †*yātñäl* in YQ 27 b 3, though I would say this is just a
scribal error due to simple omission of the *ä*-dots. Note that the Sub
VII strictly speaking consists of two subgroups: (1) suffixal *ñ*-stems
such as TA *ar-äñ-* from ^A*ar-* and (2) roots that have a nasal-extended
stem outside the subjunctive stem, either persistently such as ^A*si-n-* or
only in some stems such as ^A*o(-n)-*. As is discussed below in detail,
these two subgroups are synchronically different with respect to
correlated stem formations and also have to be kept distinct for
diachronic reasons.

22.1.1.   *Function*

Hilmarsson, 1991a, 72f. distinguishes "non-causative" and "causative"
formations, the "non-causative" forms in most instances have a TB
subjunctive equivalent of Class I, and are correlated with present
Class VIII and preterit Class III in Tocharian A. The exceptions are:
^A*o(-n)-* act. 'hit, wound', mid. 'begin', ^A*ri(-n)-* 'leave, give up', and ^A*si-n-*
act. 'satiate', mid. 'satiate oneself', 'be depressed', all of which have a
present of Class X instead of Class VIII, i.e., roots that have a nasal
extension elsewhere. These nasal-extended roots are discussed below.

As pointed out by Hilmarsson, almost all subjunctive Class VII
forms belong to transitive verbal stems, which tallies with the fact that
this class actually often functions as subjunctive stem of
antigrundverb paradigms. The only intransitive finite Sub VII forms
come from ^A*si-n-*, but in this case the intransitive valency is certainly
due to middle voice in anticausative function. For this root, I follow
Hackstein, 1995, 295 in deriving both its meanings 'satiate' and 'be
depressed' from the same root and not from different ones; note that
the intransitive meaning 'be depressed' is precisely restricted to
middle voice. The intransitive medium tantum ^A*tränk-* 'cling, stick'
may be another example, but no finite Sub VII forms are attested.

In his group of "causatives" Hilmarsson also subsumes TA *eñlune*
'advise' from ^A*en-* 'instruct'. This once attested abstract with the
meaning 'advice' clearly differs semantically from the more often
attested abstract TA *enäṣlune* 'order, instruction' built from the
subjunctive stem of Class IX, so that the subjunctive Class VII stem
has to be assigned to an antigrundverb, whereas the subjunctive of
Class IX belongs to the Kausativum II. As for Hilmarsson's second
example of a "causative" Class VII subjunctive, TA *okñäṣ* does not
belong to the root with the meaning 'grow' (this has rather to be set up
as ^A*ok-s-*), but to a root ^A*ok-* '± set in motion' and is even not a

causative at all, but the perfectly well expected TA equivalent of the Class I subjunctive found in Tocharian B (see the discussion and ref. s.v. *auk-* 'id.').

As pointed out by Hilmarsson, 1991a, 73, what was analyzed as a kausativum stem of *ABtäṅk-* 'hinder' has the same transitive meaning as the grundverb (only non-finite forms are attested from the grundverb in Tocharian A).

All in all, there are no certain causative subjunctive VII forms attested at all.[1]

22.2.   DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

Hilmarsson, 1991a, passim, has shown that in many instances *ñ*-subjunctives replace former suffixless athematic subjunctive stems, because they regularly show such a Class I subjunctive in the TB cognate and in some cases an athematic Class I formation is even still attested in Tocharian A. One further has to keep distinct two subgroups that are distinguished by the respective subjunctive stem in Tocharian B and their paradigmatic affiliation: (1) roots that have an *s*-present of Class VIII and an *s*-preterit of Class III such as, e.g., *Aar-* 'evoke' with Prs VIII, Sub VII, Pt III beside TB *er-* 'id.' with Prs VIII, Sub I, Pt III; (2) roots with what looks like a nasal extension such as *Ari(-n)-* 'leave'. The latter also have an *s*-preterit of Class III beside them (though usually from the non-extended root), and a present of Class X (i.e., an *s(k)*-present based on the nasal-extended root). The corresponding subjunctive stem of these roots in Tocharian B is an athematic one formed from the nasal-extended root such as Sub I *rin-* from *ri-n-* 'leave'. This means that in the first group we seem to have a clearly suffixal *ñ*-stem in Tocharian A beside an athematic stem that is equal to the root in Tocharian B, but in the second group nasal-subjunctive stems in both languages; the only difference is that Tocharian B has an unpalatalized nasal and inflects athematically, whereas Tocharian A has a palatalized nasal and inflects thematically. Accordingly, there is reason to believe that the thematic Class VII suffix TA *-ñä/a-* started out as a thematization of that same nasal-

---

[1] To be sure, due to the fact that in Tocharian A the *s*-present can belong both to an antigrundverb (i.e., be a genuine *s*-present) or to a kausativum (i.e., be a former *sk*-present), it is conceivable that both formerly distinct antigrundverb and kausativum stems could take on the same meaning and function.

extended subjunctive stem found in Tocharian B (= subgroup 2) and was further palatalized, and that in a second step these stems were reanalyzed as containing a suffix TA *-ñä/a-*, which finally became productive and could replace former athematic subjunctive stems such as TA * arä-* by TA *ar-ñä/a-* (= subgroup 1).

22.2.1.   *The nasal-extended roots of the type ri-n-/ ᴬri(-n)- 'leave'*

Tocharian A and B have a small group of roots showing a nasal extension either persistently or just in some stem formations. Most of these roots form TA-TB equations and can therefore be reconstructed for Proto-Tocharian:

au-n-/ ᴬo(-n)- act. 'hit, wound', mid. 'begin', *kli-n-/ ᴬkli-n-* 'be obliged to', *pi(-n)-* '?', *ri-n-/ ᴬri(-n)-* 'leave', *si-n-/ ᴬsi-n-* act. 'satiate', mid. 'satiate oneself', 'be depressed', *sai-n-* mid. 'lean on, rely on'/ (ᴬse- 'support').

That we have before us a secondary nasal extension is certain, because there are still stem formations without nasal extension attested, notably in the associated *s*-preterits such as 3.sg. Pt III TA *os* from ᴬ*o(-n)-*, etc. Whereas in *sai-n-* mid. 'lean on' the nasal was generalized, related ᴬ*se-* 'support' still only shows nasalless stems apart from the Sub VII stem TA *se-ñ-*.

   In order to explain the nasal extension, we certainly have to start with an athematic nasal stem that became a subjunctive stem such as **ri-nä-*, and to assume that this was later thematized in Tocharian A, and the nasal further turned into palatal *-ñ-* → TA *ri-ñ-*. This suggests itself from the fact that Tocharian B exactly has such athematic subjunctive stems like *rin-* (synchronically Sub I of a root *ri-n-*). In addition, Tocharian A also still shows some relic forms with non-palatalized *-n*: TA *klin-* from ᴬ*kli-n-* 'be obliged to' (see Hilmarsson, 1991a, 116), and the privative TA *asinät* from ᴬ*si-n-* 'satiate oneself' standing beside a productive subjunctive stem showing the usual palatalization TA *si-ñ-* (see Hilmarsson, 1991, 85). Note also the lack of *y*-insertion before *-ñ-* (*aräñtar*, etc.).

   The remaining questions are what is the pre-PT source of the athematic nasal stems of the type **ri-n-* and what is the source of the palatalization of the productive Class VII subjunctive suffix TA *-ñ-* in Tocharian A.

22.2.2.   *Athematic nasal stems*

Pedersen, 1941, 198 assumed that the non-palatalized subjunctive stems of the type TB *ri-n-* and the palatalized subjunctive stems of the type TA *ri-ñ-* simply reflect two different generalizations of the lautgesetzlich Tocharian outcomes of PIE subjunctive stems made from stems in *-nā- (i.e., *-neH-), which he thought could form subjunctives in *-n(H)-e/o-. Somewhat differently, Lane, 1959, 176 set up thematic present stems in *-ne/o- and *-nie/o- as a PIE basis. Pinault, 1994, 132f. rightly objected to Pedersen's view by pointing out that there are no such subjunctives from athematic nasal presents showing the zero-grade allomorph *-nH- in front of the thematic suffix to be found elsewhere. He himself suggested that we rather have to do with a secondary thematization of that zero-grade allomorph *-nH-, referring to the variation of Vedic *mr̥ṇáti* and *mr̥ṇáti*, and he further assumed generalization of the outcome of the allomorph pre-PT *-ne- > TA *-ñ-. Again differently, Hilmarsson, 1991c, 86f. proposed to derive at least the athematic PT nasal stem *säynä- (underlying *si-n-/^Asi-n-* 'be depressed') from a proto-form with the zero-grade allomorph of the suffix *-neu̯-/*-nu-,[2] which he correctly assumed should have turned into PT *-nä- by sound law, and this is in line with the fact that it is usually precisely the zero-grade allomorph of an ablauting stem that was generalized in Tocharian (if leveling took place at all). The first to propose a connection with PIE *-neu̯- presents rather than with PIE *-neH- presents was Van Windekens, 1944, 276; VW II/2, 226, but his only (and quite incorrect) claim was that the PIE full-grade allomorph *-neu̯- "devait donner *-ñu-, d'où, avec chute de *u en syllabe ouverte, -ñ-", so Hilmarsson, l.c., seems indeed to have been the first scholar to derive PT roots, or rather still just verbal stems, in what certainly started out as suffixal *-nä- from such with a PIE zero grade of that suffix *-nu-. In Adams, DoT now various TB roots/stems in *-nä- are (no doubt correctly) traced back to (infixal >) suffixal formations in *-nu-: *aun-* 'strike' (DoT, 132), *klin-* 'be necessary' (DoT, 224), *ri-n-* 'renounce, give up' (DoT, 535f.), *si-n-* 'be depressed' (DoT, 692), and *sai-n-* 'support oneself' (DoT, 700); as for *käln-* 'resound', Adams (DoT, 171) strangely only claims that underlying PT *klän- is to be derived from "PIE *klun-".

---

[2] To be sure, Hilmarsson himself seems to prefer a derivation of PT *-nä- from *-nh₁-C-, but he acknowledged that not too many people would be prepared to "accept the change of interconsonantal H_1 to Toch. *ä*".

22.2.3.   *The source of the palatal -ñ- and the problem of* [AB]*we-ñ-*
'speak'

It has hopefully become clear that the thematic subjunctive stem TA
-ñä/a- replaced an older athematic subjunctive stem in TA *-nä-* in
roots of the type [A]*ri(-n)-* 'leave', and that the palatalized thematic
suffix TA *-ñä/a-* then became productive and replaced older Sub I
stems, as certainly has been the case with [A]*ar-* 'evoke'.

A very simple solution to the problem of the source of the
palatalization would be to assume generalization of the palatalized
allomorph *-ñ-* that had to develop in front of the thematic vowel pre-
PT *-e- > PT *-'ä-. However, no similar leveling is attested for other
thematic stems in Tocharian with certainty.[3]

Very differently, Hilmarsson, 1991a, 108f. and 1991c, passim argues
that the suffix TA *-ñ-* is to be derived from PIE *-n-i̯e/o-, and from the
very same suffix he also derives the present/subjunctive stems of
Class XII in *-ññ-*. The different shapes of the suffixes he explains by
different accentuation: geminated *-ññä/æ- he claims was simplified
whenever the accent followed, but was retained when the accent
preceded the suffix. Nasal presents from aniṭ roots "were extended to
-ñy-; no such presents survive [...] for they have all been replaced by
*-s(k)-*presents; their original subjunctives in *-ä-* may have either
survived in the types B *erä-*, A *tränkä-* [...] or they have been replaced
by the presents in *-ñy-*".[4]

Peters, 2006, 344f., fn. 48 assumed that first Prs VIII stems
developed completely new Sub VII stems (replacing former Sub I
stems) beside them on the model of TA **we-s-* : TA *we-ñ-* = TA *ar-s-* :
x, x = TA *ar-ñ-*, and that these new Sub VII stems then finally
triggered a substitution of *-n-* by *-ñ-* in former Sub I forms in **-nä-*.
Although such a present stem TA **we-s-* is actually not attested in
Tocharian A (we find forms from [A]*tränk-* instead), Winter, 1977, 151f.
= 1984, 196ff. = 2005, 188f. made a case for the assumption that such an

---

[3] Unless one wants to follow Winter's explanation of the *klyauṣa*-type
preterit, see chap. Pt I 7.3.9., which I do not. Note, however, that the thematic
subjunctive stem of [A]*lä-n-t-* 'go out' also shows a persistent stem-final
palatalization, but the generalization of *-c-* here was certainly a consequence
of persistent root-final *-c-* in the respective irregular Pt VI.

[4] The noun *auñento*/TA *oñant* 'beginning', which is certainly an old *nt*-
participle, proves, according to Hilmarsson, that such *ñy*-presents once really
existed in Tocharian B, but the stem-final palatalization in *auñento* may also
have another explanation; see Peters, 2006, 344, fn. 48.

s-present stem has to be set up for pre-Tocharian A for different reasons, see the following discussion.

22.2.3.1. *ᴬᴮwe-ñ-* 'speak'

The root *ᴬwe-ñ-* 'speak' is the only root in Tocharian A showing a persistent final TA -*ñ*-, i.e., the palatal nasal is not confined to the subjunctive, and *ᴮwe-ñ-* 'speak' likewise has a persistent palatal nasal. The obvious solution for this fact is that *ᴬᴮwe-ñ-* had a genuine palatal nasal already in Proto-Tocharian.

As early as Lévi/Meillet, 1912a, 285, the root *ᴬᴮwe-ñ-* 'speak' has been derived from PIE *√u̯ekᵘ 'speak'; as for the actual stem formation, Lane 1953, 287 proposed *u̯okʷ-n-i̯e/o-, followed, e.g., by Winter, 1977, 133ff. = 1984, 178ff. = 2005, 170ff., and Hilmarsson, 1991a, 61ff., esp. 105f., but see the objections with respect to syllabification by Peters, 2006, 344, fn. 47. Peters himself rather follows the etymological derivation from *√h₂u̯edh₂ 'utter' proposed by Pinault, 1994, 134f. Pinault sets up a stem *h₂u̯od-n(h₂)-e/o- → *weñ-* in order to avoid the problem of lack of gemination. Differently, Peters, 2006, 344 with fn. 48 sets up *h₂u̯oden-i̯e/o-. As for the lack of the gemination to be expected as lautgesetzlich in the outcome from a sequence *-n-i̯e/o-, Peters correctly points out that there is no independent evidence for the sound law proposed by Winter and Hilmarsson who claimed -*ññ*- was to be simplified before the accent. Peters himself rather assumes that simplification of the expected geminate *-*ññ*- in this root is a progressive informal-style feature of a form of high frequency; similarly Adams, apud Hilmarsson, 1991a, 114, fn. 17. As support for such a progressive sound change to have occurred precisely in this root Peters refers to the 3.sg. Pt TA *we* (instead of ⁺*weṃ*) that certainly does show such an informal reduction, as per Winter, 1977, 155f. = 1984, 201 = 2005, 192f.

As for the other stems from that root, the subjunctive stem *weñ-*/ TA *weñ-* is certainly the basic stem formation, and the *sk*-present in Tocharian B secondary; see Winter, 1977, 147ff. = 2005, 184ff. Winter also correctly argues that a former *sk*-less present stem is presupposed by the nomen agentis *weñenta* and possibly by the *mo*-adjective *weñmo*, both kinds of formations being regularly derived from the present stem.[5] As for the present stem in Tocharian A, it is

---

[5] *weñmo* is attested once in the metrical passage H 149.26/30 a 3 showing the usual deletion of what seems to have been accented *á̈. Winter, l.c., is somewhat reluctant to accept the *mo*-adjective *weñmo* as further evidence for

synchronically suppleted by *A*träṅk-, but Winter, l.c., adduces some arguments for the former existence of an *sk*-stem *wæys- in (pre-)Tocharian A.[6]

22.2.3.2.   *AB*lä-n-t- 'go out'

The subjunctive stem *länn*-, TA *läñc*- of the root *AB*lä-n-t- 'go out' has traditionally been connected with the TA subjunctives in TA *-ñ-*. The root apparently goes back to *$\sqrt{h_1}$leu̯d^h 'steigen, wachsen' (²LIV, 248f.), the Toch. preterit directly continues the PIE thematic (or thematized) aorist stem. The subjunctive stem, and based on it the present stem as well, show a nasal infix in both Tocharian A and B, going back to PT *länt-, and since it is generally assumed that the geminate *-nn*- in Tocharian B can only continue **-nt-n*- but not simple **-nt*- (cf. Hilmarsson, 1991a, 62; Hackstein, 1995, 309 with ref.),[7] it is usually concluded that we have to do with a nasal stem formation based on an inherited nasal-infix stem (cf. Hilmarsson, 1991a, 63; Pinault, 1994, 129ff.; Hackstein, 1995, 309ff.). Differently, Peters, 2006, 345, fn. 48 posits an informal-style development, i.e., an assimilation **-nt*- > *-nn*- taken over into the formal styles in a form of high frequency.

While the TA subjunctive stem *läñc*- is thematic and shows persistent stem-final palatalization, the inflection of the subjunctive in

---

the former existence of a present stem *weñ*-, because, according to him, at least *waskāmo* from *wāsk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'stir, move' seems to be derived from a subjunctive stem. However, *waskāmo* might as well simply attest to a former Prs V that was replaced by a Prs XII. As for the other alleged examples of *mo*-adjectives based on subjunctive stems as given by the manuals, Winter, l.c., correctly points out that *päknāmo* may likewise reflect a former Prs VI (replaced by a Prs XI); finally, *wkänmo* is a ghost form, see s.v. *auk*- '± set in motion'. On the other hand, there are *mo*-formations that are quite certainly based on a present stem, cf.: *lyukemo* 'shining' based on Prs III *lyuke*- from *luk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'shine', Abstr *kälṣämñe* 'patience' (← *kälṣamo) based on Prs VIII *kälṣ*- from *käl*- 'endure' (cf. WTG, 47f., § 40). On *mo*-adjectives see now also Pinault, 2008b, 440ff.

[6] Note that *träṅk*- in Tocharian B has the meaning 'lament', and that this narrower meaning is certainly the older one, so that at least the meaning 'speak' is due to an inner-TA innovation.

[7] To be sure, the only example of preservation of *-tn*- comes from the Prs VI stem of *kät*ᵃ- 'strew', and as Hackstein, l.c., points out correctly, in this case we could easily assume analogical reshaping. Note that the reading *kätnā*- (and not †*kännā*-) is certain, because in this manuscript (MQ text 205) ⟨tn⟩ and ⟨nn⟩ can indeed still be kept distinct.

Tocharian B is debated. We have the following paradigm in Tocharian B: Sub 1.sg. *lannu*, 2.sg. *lant*, 3.sg. *laṃ*, 3.pl. *laṃ*, Opt 1.sg. *läññam* (sic), 2.sg. *lyñit* (MQ), 3.sg. *laññi*, 3.pl. *laññeṃ*, Ger II *lalyai*, Abstr II *lalñe*, Inf *lantsi.* Athematic inflection is set up by Schmidt, 1985, 429 because of the 3.pl. *laṃ*; similarly Hilmarsson, 1991a, 62 because of the 1.sg. *lannu*, i.e., -*u* being the regular athematic 1.sg. ending in Tocharian B in contrast to thematic -*au.* Differently, Pinault, 1994, 129ff. rather takes 1.sg. *lannu*[8] as proof of a thematic paradigm by arguing that (*)-*nu* is to be derived from pre-PT *-nō < PIE *-n(H)-o-h_2; similarly on the 1.sg. -*u* Hackstein, 1995, 151f., fn. 7. As for the other non-palatalized forms of Tocharian B, Pinault, l.c., states that the 3.sg. *laṃ* had to turn out from palatalized "*läññä + ṃ*" by sound law, and that afterwards depalatalization could affect the 2.sg. *lant* analogically.[9] Differently, Hilmarsson, 1991a, 62f. connects (athematic) *länt-nä- with the type "*sinä-*". Hackstein, 1995, 309ff. reconstructs an inherited nasal present subjunctive *$h_1$lu-ne-d^h-e/o-, explaining the persistent palatalization met in Tocharian A from *-ne-d^h- > *-ñät- > TA -*ñc-*. Most recently, Peters, 2006, 337, fn. 19 suggests to set up either expected athematic *$h_1$lund^h-mi "oder eventuell *$h_1$lund^h-nu-mi", the thematic inflection of Tocharian A being due to secondary thematization also to be seen elsewhere.

---

[8] Note that while the ligatures denoting *nt* and *nn* are indistinguishable in most manuscripts, precisely if combined with the sign for the vowel *u* the two are clearly distinct, so that a reading *nnu* (and not †*ntu*) is beyond doubt.

[9] In my opinion, the 2.sg. has indeed to be read as *lant*, which is the expected form, and not "*lat*" as given in the manuals; see s.v. *lä-n-t-*.

THE OPTATIVE

The optative is based on the subjunctive stem. In both languages, the optative suffix is usually -*ĭ*-; only in Tocharian B there is in addition an optative suffix allomorph -*oy*- to be found with the subjunctive stem classes ending in stem-final -*ā*- (Classes V and VI), cf. WTG, 113, § 117. In contrast, Tocharian A also shows the suffix allomorph TA -*ĭ*- in these *ā*-subjunctive stems. The same distribution of suffix allomorphs is found in the imperfect, which is similarly formed with a suffix -*ĭ*- to the respective present stem of a root. Unlike the imperfect, however, there are no suppletive optative forms.

It is generally assumed that the optative(/imperfect) suffix -*ĭ*- is to be derived from the athematic PIE optative suffix *-ih$_1$-, cf., e.g., Pinault, 1997a, 219f. with ref. While in Tocharian B the suffix -*ĭ*- always palatalizes a palatalizable stem final, Tocharian A descriptively shows non-palatalized examples, which are discussed below.

23.1. TOCHARIAN B

The following verbs show optative forms in Tocharian B (sorted according to subjunctive class):

SUBJUNCTIVE I: *ār$^{(a)}$*- Antigv. 'leave, give up, abandon', *āl$^{(a)}$*- Antigv. 'keep away', *eṅk*- 'seize, take, understand', *er*- 'evoke, cause', *ai* act. 'give', mid. 'take', *auk*- '± set in motion', *täk*- 'touch', *täṅk*- 'hinder', *träṅk*- 'lament', *treṅk*- 'cling, stick', *pärk*- 'ask, beg', *pyāk*- 'strike, beat', *plätk*- 'overflow, develop, arise', *plu*- 'float, fly', *yām*- 'do', *yäp*- 'enter, set', *ri-n*- 'leave, give up', *ru*- act. 'open (tr)', mid. 'open (itr)'; SUBJUNCTIVE II: *āks*- 'announce, proclaim, say', *aik*- 'know, recognize', *käm*- 'come', *klyaus*- 'hear, listen to', *cämp*- 'be able to', *tās*- act. 'put, set, place', mid. 'place oneself', *trik$^{(a)}$*- Antigv. 'miss, fail, go astray; lead astray', *nāsk*- 'bathe, swim', *pāsk*- 'protect; obey; beware of', *pälk$^{(a)}$*- Antigv. 'burn, torment', *mān(t)s$^{(a)}$*-'be sorrowful', *yāsk*- 'beg', *lāṃs*- 'work on, perform, build', *lut*- act. 'remove, expel', mid. 'cross, leave', *lyäk*- 'lie', *wik$^{(a)}$*- Antigv. 'avoid', *śāw*- 'live', *ṣärp*- 'indicate, explain, instruct', *soy*- 'become sated, satisfied'; SUBJUNCTIVE I/II: *aiw$^{(a)}$*- Antigv. 'turn to', *kätt*- 'put, set (down)', *kli-n*- 'be obliged to', *cäṅk*- 'please'; SUBJUNCTIVE III: *kän$^{(a)}$*- 'come

about, occur', *täm*- 'be born, come into being', *näk*- 'be destroyed, disappear', *ru*- 'open (itr)', *tsäk*- 'burn (itr)'; SUBJUNCTIVE IV: *ākl*- 'learn', *auks*- 'grow, increase' (?), *kälyp*- 'steal'; SUBJUNCTIVE V: *āks^a*-'waken', *ār^(a)*- 'cease, come to an end', *ārt(t)^(a)*- 'be pleased with, love, praise', *kāk^a*- 'call, invite', *kānt^a*- 'rub (away)', *kät^a*- 'strew', *kätk^(a)*- 'cross, pass', *kärs^(a)*- 'know, understand, recognize', *kärst^a*- 'cut off, destroy', *käsk^(a)*- 'scatter', *kul^a*- 'recede', *kaut^a*- 'split, cleave', *kraup^(a)*- 'gather', *klāy^a*- 'fall', *klänts^(a)*- 'sleep', *klautk^(a)*- 'turn, become', *kwäs^a*- 'lament', *tāk^a*- 'be, become', *tāpp^a*- '?', *täks^a*- '± destroy', *tätt^a*- act. 'put, set, place', mid. 'place oneself', *tärk^a*- 'dismiss, emit', *triw^(a)*- 'be mixed, shaken', *nān^(a)*- 'appear', *nāsk^a*- 'spin', *nu^(a)*- 'cry', *nuk^a*- 'swallow', *naut^(a)*- 'disappear', *pātk^a*- 'give up', *pänn^a*- 'stretch, pull (out, up)', *pärk^a*- '(a)rise, become clear', *päl^a*- 'praise', *pälsk^a*- 'consider, think', *paut^a*- 'honor, flatter', *prutk^(a)*- 'be shut; be filled', *mäk^(a)*- 'run', *märs^(a)*- 'forget', *yāt^(a)*- 'be (cap)able', *yuk^(a)*- 'overcome, conquer, vanquish', *rāp^a*- 'dig, plow', *räk^(a)*- 'extend oneself (over)', *räm^a*- 'bend, bow', *rit^a*- 'seek, long for', *ritt^(a)*- 'be attached, linked to, persist', *läk^(a)*- 'see, look', *lik^(a)*- 'wash', *lup^(a)*- 'rub; besmirch; throw into', *wāk^(a)*- 'split apart, bloom', *wāy^a*- 'lead, guide, drive', *wāl^a*- 'cover, surround, conceal', *wālts^a*- 'crush, grind', *wätk^(a)*- 'decide, be decided, differ', *wärp^a*- 'enjoy; suffer; receive; consent', *wik^(a)*- 'disappear', *wlāw^a*- 'control, restrain oneself', *śuw^a*- 'eat, consume', *sälk^a*- 'pull; show', *skāy^a*- 'strive, attempt', *skär^a*- 'scold, reproach; threaten', *stäm^(a)*- 'stand', *spārtt^(a)*- 'turn; behave; be', *spänt^(a)*- 'trust', *spärk^(a)*- 'disappear, perish', *sruk^a*- 'die', *swās^(a)*- 'rain', *tsārw^(a)*- 'be comforted, take heart', *tsäṅk^a*- '(a)rise', *tsäm^(a)*- 'grow, increase, come into being', *tsälp^(a)*- 'pass away, be released, redeemed'; SUBJUNCTIVE VI: *kälp^(a)*- 'obtain', *päk^a*- 'intend', *yänm^(a)*- 'achieve, reach'; SUBJUNCTIVE IXa: *win^a-sk*- act. 'venerate, honor', mid. 'confess'; SUBJUNCTIVE IXb: *ār^(a)*- Kaus. II 'give up, abandon', *kārp^(a)*- Kaus. I 'make descend', *kärs^(a)*- Kaus. IV 'make know(n)', *tāl^(a)*- Kaus. III 'lift up, carry', *twās^(a)*- Kaus. I 'kindle', *präṅk^(a)*- Kaus. I 'reject', *mäṅk^(a)*- Kaus. I 'overcome', *mi*- 'hurt, harm', *yāt^(a)*- Kaus. II 'enable, tame', *wārw^(a?)*- Kaus. I 'spur on, prod, urge', *wätk^(a)*- Kaus. II 'command', *wik^(a)*- Kaus. II 'drive away, remove', *śänm*- 'bind; determine (rules)', *spārtt^(a)*- Kaus. I 'turn', *spärk^(a)*- Kaus. II 'cause to disappear, destroy', *swās^(a)*- Kaus. I 'let rain', *tsälp^(a)*- Kaus. I 'redeem, free'; SUBJUNCTIVE Xb: *täm*- Kaus. I 'beget, generate'; SUBJUNCTIVE XII: *suk^?*- 'hang down; hesitate'.

The following optative forms are actually attested:

SUBJUNCTIVE I: act. 1.sg. *ewśim* (MQ), *taśim*, *pyāśim-me*, *yamim*, *yapim*, *ruwim*, 2.sg. *parśit*, *pyāśi-ne*, *yapit*, 3.sg. *āri*, *eri*, *ayi-ne*, *taśi*, *tañci*, *trañci*, *parśi-ne*, *pluwi*, *yāmi*, *yapi*, 1.pl. *yamyem* (MQ), *yäpyem* (MQ), 2.pl. *yamīcer*, 3.pl. *taśyeṃ*, *pyāśyeṃ* (MQ), *placyeṃ*, *yāmyeṃ*; mid. 1.sg. *eñcīmar*, *erimar*, *auśimar*, *treñcīmar*, *yamīmar*, *riñīmar*, 2.sg. *eñcitar*, *eritar*, *yāmītār* (MQ), 3.sg. *eñcītär*, *eritär*, *ayītär*, *yamītär*, *riñitär*, 1.pl. *yamiyemtär*, 3.pl. *ālyintär* (MQ); SUBJUNCTIVE II: act. 1.sg. *akṣim*, *cämpim*, *triśim*, *wīśim*, *śayim*, 2.sg. *akṣīt*

(MQ), *ṣärpit* (MQ), 3.sg. *āksi*, *śäṃmi-ne* (MQ), *klyauṣi*, *campi*, *tāṣi*, *trīśi*, *nāṣṣi*, *lyucī-ne*, *lyaśi*, *wīśi*, *śāyi*, *ṣarpi*, *soyi*, 3.pl. *śänmīyeṃ*, *klyauṣiyeṃ*, *triśyeṃ*; mid. 1.sg. *śmīmar/śanmīmar*, *triśimar*, *paṣṣīmar*, *meṃṣīmar*, 3.sg. *aiśitär*, *paṣṣītär*, *palyśitär*, *laṃṣītär*, 3.pl. *yaṣyeṃtär*; SUBJUNCTIVE I/II: act. 3.sg. *klyīñī* (sic)/ *kliñi-ñ* (MQ), 3.pl. *kliñeṃ*, *cäñcyeṃ* (MQ); mid. 3.sg. *aiwītär-ñ*, *käccītär*; SUBJUNCTIVE III: mid. 1.sg. *cmīmar*, 3.sg. *kñitär/käñiyoytär/kñyoytar*, *cmītär*, *näśītär/nśītär*, *tsśītär*, 2.pl. *tsśitär*, 3.pl. *ruwyeṃtär*; SUBJUNCTIVE IV: act. 3.sg. *kalypi*, 1.pl. *kälypiyem*; mid. 3.pl. *aklyiyentär*; SUBJUNCTIVE V: act. 1.sg. *āksoym*, *karsoym*, *karstoym*, *kaloym*, *tākoym/tākom*, *tāksoym*, *tarkoym*, *pannoym*, *pälskoym* (MQ), *marsoym*, *yūkoym*, *lkoym*, *skāyoym*, *stamoym*, *spārttoym*, *swāsoy*, 2.sg. *kärstoyt* (MQ), *tākoyt*, *tärkoyt* (MQ), *nukoyt*, *wätkoyt*, 3.sg. *āroy*, *ārttoy*, *karsoy*, *kautoy*, *klāyoy*, *klantsoⁱ̣*, *klautkoy*, *tākoy*, *tarkoy*, *nāskoy*, *pātkoy*, *pannoy*, *pälskoy* (MQ), *pautoy*, *yātoⁱ̣-ñ*, *rāpoy*, *lakoy*, *lamoy*, *laupoy*, *wākoⁱ̣*, *wāyoy*, *wāloy-c* (MQ), *wāltsoy*, *śuwoy*, *salkoy-ne*, *skāyoy*, *skāroy*, *stamoy*, *spārtoy*, *srūkoy*, *tsaṅkoy*, 1.pl. *klautkoyem*, *tākoyem*, 2.pl. *tākoycer*, *lkoycer*, 3.pl. *aron* (MQ), *karsoṃ*, *klāyoyeṃ/ klāyo-ñ*, *klautkoṃ*, *tākoyeṃ/tākoṃ*, *tāppoṃ*, *tarko-ñ*, *pannoṃ*, *yātoyeṃ-ś*, *ramoṃ*, *lkoyeṃ*, *waloṃ* (MQ), *stämoṃ* (MQ), *tsäṅkon-me*; mid. 1.sg. *ārttoymar*, *kākoymar*, *karstoymar*, *triwoymar*, *pāloymar*, *marsoym*, *wāyoymar*, *warpoymar*, *wlāwoymar*, *tsälpoymar*, 3.sg. *ārtoytär*, *kāntoytär*, *katoytär*, *kätkoytär*, *kärsoytär*, *kartsoytär*, *kaloytar*, *käskoytar*, *k̑ᵤloytär*, *kraupoytär*, *nanoytär*, *nuwoytär*, *pärkoytär*, *palskoytär*, *prutkoytär*, *mäkoytär* (MQ), *rmoytär*, *rītoytär*, *rittoytär*, *warpoytär*, *wikoytär*, *spārtoytär*, *späntoytär*, *spärkoytär*, *tsārwoytär* (MQ), *tsmoytär-ñ*, *tsälpauytär* (MQ), 1.pl. *wätkomtär*, 3.pl. *kwāsoyentär*, *rākoyentär-ñ*, *lkoyentär*, *laikontär-ñ*, *wärpontär* (MQ)/ *wärpoyentär*, *wikoyntär/wikoyentär*, *srukoyentär*, *tsälpoyntar/tsälpontär*; SUBJUNCTIVE VI: act. 1.sg. *källoym*, *yänmoym*, 3.sg. *kalloy*, *yanmoy*, 3.pl. *källoyeṃ/ källoṃ*, *yänmoyeṃ/yanmoṃ* (MQ); mid. 3.sg. *päknoytär*; SUBJUNCTIVE IXa: act. 3.sg. *wināṣṣi*; SUBJUNCTIVE IXb: act. 1.sg. *kārpäṣṣim*, *twāsäṣṣim*, *pyutkäṣṣim*, *praṅkäṣṣim*, *maṅkäṣṣim*, *wīkäṣṣim*, *ṣpartaṣṣim*, 3.sg. *śarsäṣṣi*, *tälaṣṣi* (MQ), *mīyäṣṣi*, *watkaṣṣi*, *wikäṣṣi*, *ṣparkäṣṣi*, 3.pl. *swāṣye-ñ*; mid. 1.sg. *yātäṣṣimar*, *tsälpaṣṣimar* (MQ), 3.sg. *arṣṣītär-ñ*, *yātäṣṣītär*, 3.pl. *miyäṣyentär*; SUBJUNCTIVE Xb: act. 3.sg. *śanmäṣṣi*; mid. 3.sg. *tanmaṣṣitär*; SUBJUNCTIVE XII: mid. 3.sg. *sukaññitär*, 3.pl. *sukaññiyentär*.

23.1.1.   *The suffix allomorph -oy-*

The optative(/imperfect) allomorph *-oy-* appears in forms based on subjunctive stems in stem-final *-ā-*,[1] so that it is conceivable to assume

---

[1] But note that the Sub V stem *tätt*ᵃ- 'put' has what looks synchronically like an athematic 1.sg. Opt *taccimar* with initial accent. Diachronically, we are dealing with the old PIE optative stem *dʰi/e-dʰh₁-ih₁- → *täcci-* (see Adams,

that *-oy(-)* is to be derived from the stem-final PT *-ā- plus the usual suffix *-ĭ-, the more since it does not palatalize root finals as the allomorph *-ĭ́-* does (see Pedersen, 1941, 203f.; WTG, 114, § 117, fn. 2; TEB I, 218, § 393; Pinault, 2008, 440).[2] What is remarkable is that such a sequence developed into an *oy*-diphthong and not into an *ai*-diphthong, because PT *ā usually turned into TB *ā*, and not into *o.* Hilmarsson, 1988, 43f., with fn. 2 reckons with a different development of *ā plus non-syllabic *i and *ā plus syllabic *ya: "Common Toch. *āi was retained and yielded B *ai*, A *e*, whereas Common Toch. *āy became *oy*". That these diphthongs developed differently is also shown by Peters, 2006, 333, fn. 14. Hackstein, 1995, 300, fn. 32 further points out that based on a possible derivation of the verbal stem *soy-* 'satiate' from PIE *sh_2-i̯e/o- (following Jasanoff, 1978, 29, fn. 9) the optative allomorph *-oy-* may be derived from *-h_2i̯- > *-oy-* "*-h_x-ih_1- > *-a-i̯i̯- > B *-óy-*".

23.1.2. *Endings*

The earlier shapes of the endings 1.sg. active *-im* < *-mä < *-mi and the 2.sg. active *-it* < *-tä ← *-th_2a still influence the accent of the forms, as can be seen with, e.g., 1.sg. *yamim* from *yām-*, etc. Optatives built from subjunctive stems with persistent initial accent (such as 1.sg. *yapim* /yä́pim/ and 2.sg. *yapit* /yä́pit/ from *yäp-* 'enter'), of course, have morphologically caused initial accent.

   The 1.pl.act. only has the thematic ending *-em*, and similarly the 3.pl.act. always has the thematic ending *-eṃ*. Note that the 1.pl.act. and 3.pl.act. are exactly the persons into which thematic endings in basically athematic stem formations intruded most easily. The same is

---

DoT, 285), which was reinterpreted as an athematic stem formation, and hence acquired the initial accent of the (majority of) athematic optatives.

   [2] Couvreur, 1947a, 64f., § 109 and 74, § 123, followed by VW II/2, 232f. derived the suffix allomorph *-oy-* not from the *ā*-subjunctive stem, but assumed a formation from the present stem Class IV in stem-final *-o-*, so that the optative of A-character stems was formerly based on the present stem, but this would be morphologically bizarre. On the other hand, one may toy with the idea that this optative allomorph originated in preterit stems in final *-å̄- (preserved in the PPt type in *-au*, *-oṣ*, see the discussion in chap. Pt I 7.3.3.) that transferred this *-å̄- to the subjunctive stem; *-å̄i̯- > *-oy-* was generalized as optative morpheme, but (*)-ā- (from the other *ā*-stem formations) as a subjunctive morpheme, cf. Klingenschmitt, 1975, 159 = 2005, 143.

true for the 1.pl.mid. -*emtär* and also for most cases of the 3.pl.mid. -*entär*, although there is still an athematic 3.pl.mid. *ālyintär* attested in an old manuscript.[3]

The 3.pl. active optative from *(n)ā*-subjunctive stems shows an ending variant -*oṃ* beside -*oyeṃ*, and the same allomorphy is to be seen in the structurally similar imperfect, see the collection of forms in Peyrot, 2008, 143. Winter, 1985, 263 = 2005, 291 assumed that -*oṃ* is the lautgesetzlich outcome of the sequence *-oyn, whereas -*oyeṃ* is analogically restored, a view now supported by Peyrot, 2008, 143, who shows that archaic texts display the shorter ending while colloquial texts have the longer variant.

The same loss of *y* before a nasal is also attested in the 3.pl.mid Opt (e.g., *tsälponträ*) and before endings beginning with *m*, notably the 1.pl.mid. (e.g., *wätkomtär*) and possibly also in the 1.pl.act. *tākoṃm* (sic) in PK AS 17E b 6 (as per Peyrot, l.c.). Again, these shorter variants are almost entirely confined to archaic texts as well. There is one possible example of a 1.sg.act. desincence -*om* < -*oym*: *tākom* in THT 1540 frg. f + g a 5 (MQ): *tākom ñaś* (sic), for which see Schmidt, 2007, 232 (though Schmidt claims in fn. 5 that the form is a mere misspelling for *tāko⌣ₗm*).[4]

23.1.3.   *Metrical syncope of -i-*

The suffix allomorph -*iy*- occurring before endings beginning with a vowel (1.pl.act., 3.pl.act., 1.pl.mid., and 3.pl.mid.) can be reduced to -*y*- in metrical passages, see Winter, 1990, 375 = 2005, 397 with ref. Such metrically syncopated forms are usually written as if the syncopated syllable still had the accent. The only syncopated optative form that clearly behaves like the majority of the other examples of metrical schwa deletion is the 3.pl.mid. *yaṣyeṃtär* from *yāsk*-. Most other syncopated optative forms are either MQ forms, ambiguous with respect to accent (because of their structure), or built from a subjunctive stem with persistent initial accent. In contrast, the unambiguous, non-MQ 3.pl.act. *yāmyeṃ* precisely seems to contradict the expectation of the accent rule given above; for an explanation see chap. Pt IV 10.1.2.3.

---

[3] For the classification see Malzahn, 2007a, 264ff., and for the analysis as Opt of Sub I see the discussion in chap. Sub IV 21.1.1.

[4] Instead of *(källo)m*, one has to read *(källo)[ₗ]m* in 229 a 4; see Peyrot, 2008, 144, fn. 241.

23.2. TOCHARIAN A

The inflection of the optative in Tocharian A does not show any
allomorphs.

1.sg.act.	*yāmim*	1.sg.mid.	*kälpimār*
2.sg.act.	*yāmit*	2.sg.mid.	*kälpitār*
3.sg.act.	*yāmiṣ*	3.sg.mid.	*kälpitär*
1.pl.act.	*yāmimäs*	1.pl.mid.	*kälpimtär*
2.pl.act.	—	2.pl.mid.	—
3.pl.act.	*klyoṣiñc*	3.pl.mid.	*kälpintär*

From the following roots optative forms are attested (sorted by Sub
class):

SUBJUNCTIVE I: ᴬ*e-* 'give' (Sub I + II), probably also ᴬ*wäs-* 'don' (or Sub V);
SUBJUNCTIVE II: ᴬ*kum-* 'come', ᴬ*klyos-* 'hear, listen to', ᴬ*cämp-* 'be able to',
ᴬ*yäm-* 'do', ᴬ*lä-n-t-* 'go out, emerge', ᴬ*wles-* 'perform, build', ᴬ*śäw-* 'live',
ᴬ*tā(-s)-* 'put'; SUBJUNCTIVE I/II: ᴬ*tsāk-* 'glow'; SUBJUNCTIVE III: ᴬ*kän-* 'come
about', ᴬ*täm-* 'be borne', ᴬ*näk-* 'fall into ruin'; SUBJUNCTIVE V: ᴬ*ār⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cease' (?),
ᴬ*ārt^a-* 'love', ᴬ*emts⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'seize', ᴬ*kām^a-* 'carry', ᴬ*kälk^a-* 'go', ᴬ*kärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'know', ᴬ*käl^a-*
'lead', ᴬ*kälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'obtain', ᴬ*kul^a-* 'recede', ᴬ*krop⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'gather', ᴬ*klāw^a-* 'fall', ᴬ*tāk⁽ᵃ⁾-*
'be', ᴬ*tāp^a-* 'eat', ᴬ*tā(-s)-* 'put', ᴬ*twās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'burn', ᴬ*pälk^a-* 'see', ᴬ*plānt⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'rejoice',
ᴬ*märs^a-* 'forget', ᴬ*mlusk^a-* 'escape', ᴬ*yāt⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be (cap)able', ᴬ*yäks^a-* 'entangle',
ᴬ*rit^a-* 'seek', ᴬ*läm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sit', ᴬ*lotk^a-* 'turn', ᴬ*wā-* 'lead', ᴬ*wärp^a-* 'enjoy', ᴬ*ṣtäm⁽ᵃ⁾-*
'stand', ᴬ*sälp^a-* 'glow', ᴬ*skāy^a-* 'strive', ᴬ*tsäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pull', ᴬ*tsälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pass away',
ᴬ*tsit⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'touch'; SUBJUNCTIVE VI: ᴬ*päk^a-* 'intend', ᴬ*yäk^a-* 'be careless', ᴬ*yom⁽ᵃ⁾-*
'achieve'; SUBJUNCTIVE VII: ᴬ*ar-* 'evoke', ᴬ*kläṅk⁽ᵃ⁾?-* Antigv. 'doubt', ᴬ*ri(-n)-*
'leave', ᴬ*läṅk-* Antigv. 'let dangle', ᴬ*we-ñ-* 'speak', ᴬ*ṣärp-* 'indicate', ᴬ*sāk⁽ᵃ⁾-*
Antigv. 'restrain'; SUBJUNCTIVE IX: ᴬ*emts⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. III/IV '?', ᴬ*lutk⁽ᵃ⁾?-* 'turn into',
ᴬ*yät-* 'adorn', ᴬ*yär⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'bathe', ᴬ*yu⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. III 'aspire', ᴬ*läm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I
'set', ᴬ*wär-* 'practice', ᴬ*ṣärp-* 'indicate', ᴬ*ṣtäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'set', ᴬ*tsälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I
'redeem'; SUBJUNCTIVE XII: ᴬ*āks-* 'announce', ᴬ*kāṣ-iññ-* 'reprimand'.

23.2.1. *Palatalization of the stem final*

Palatalization of a palatalizable stem final consonant is attested for the
following examples: ᴬ*klyos-* (Sub II), ᴬ*lä-n-t-* (Sub II), ᴬ*wles-* (Sub II),
ᴬ*tā(-s)-* 'put' (Sub II), ᴬ*tsāk-* (Sub I or II); ᴬ*näk-* (Sub III), ᴬ*yäks^a-* (Sub
V). Naturally, optatives based on subjunctive stems of Classes VII, IX,
and XII also always show a palatalized suffix, but these cases are, of

course, not diagnostic, because the respective subjunctive stem have a consistent palatal.

Lack of palatalization is attested for the following forms with palatalizable root final: *A*wäs- (Sub I/V); *A*kän- (Sub III); *A*em̥ts*⁽ᵃ⁾*- (Sub V), *A*kälk*ᵃ*- (Sub V), *A*kärs*⁽ᵃ⁾*- (Sub V), *A*käl*ᵃ*- (Sub V), *A*kul*ᵃ*- (Sub V), *A*tāk*⁽ᵃ⁾*- (Sub V), *A*twās*⁽ᵃ⁾*- (Sub V), *A*pälk*ᵃ*- (Sub V), *A*plānt*⁽ᵃ⁾*- (Sub V), *A*märs*ᵃ*- (Sub V), *A*mlusk*ᵃ*- (Sub V), *A*yāt*⁽ᵃ⁾*- (Sub V), *A*rit*ᵃ*- (Sub V), *A*lotk*ᵃ*- (Sub V), *A*ṣtäm*⁽ᵃ⁾*- (Sub V), *A*tsäk*⁽ᵃ⁾*- (Sub V), *A*tsit*⁽ᵃ⁾*- (Sub V), *A*yom*⁽ᵃ⁾*- (Sub VI).

It is clear that lack of palatalization is regular with optatives based on subjunctive Class V, the only exception is a palatalized Opt TA yakṣintr-äm̥ in A 101 a 1 from *A*yäks*ᵃ*-, which may be explained analogically. In contrast, the imperfect, which is formed with a similar suffix TA -ĭ- but based on the present stem, always palatalizes a palatalizable stem final.

Lack of palatalization has sometimes been explained as a reflex of a PIE optative suffix *-oi̯-, e.g., by Pedersen, 1941, 203f. Adams, 1978, 285 suggests that the lack of palatalization is rather analogical, i.e., that Tocharian A at first behaved similarly to Tocharian B and added the optative suffix to the ā-stem, so that the root was not palatalized, and later the resulting optative suffix, i.e., an TA equivalent of -oy-,[5] was analogically replaced by TA -ĭ-, but the non-palatalized root final retained.

As for subjunctive Class III, we have one example showing palatalization (*A*näk- 'be destroyed': Opt TA nśitär), and one example not showing palatalization, although the root final is palatalizable (*A*kän- 'come about' TA knitär). This lack of palatalization is no strict proof for the Class III subjunctive going back to thematic stems (as is argued in chap. Sub III), but TA knitär may simply reflect a former Sub V stem *känā-, i.e., influence of an optative to Sub V that is also reflected in the TB Opt variants käñiyoytär and kñyoytar, as per Peters, 2006, 334f., fn. 16.; see also chap. Sub III 20.1.2.

---

[5] Strictly speaking, the lautgesetzlich equivalent of TB -oy- in word-internal position is unknown, because undisputed examples are only to be found in word-final position, and these show TB -oy vs. TA -e (such as yapoy = TA ype 'land', soy = TA se 'son'; cf. TEB I, 51, § 18,2,b).

23.2.2. *Irregular optative forms*

Two optatives made from what should be subjunctives of Class VI show an irregular formation: 3.sg.mid. Opt TA *päknāśitär* from [A]*päk[a]*- 'intend' and 3.sg.mid. Opt TA *yäknāśśitär* from [A]*yäk[a]*- 'be careless'. To be sure, there are no other forms attested of either subjunctive stems, but since the corresponding subjunctive class in Tocharian B is indeed a Class VI subjunctive, and since the respective present (Class X) and preterit (Class I) stems are usually correlated with Sub VI, the subjunctive Class VI can indeed be set up with certainty.[6] TG, 362, fn. 1; Lane, 1959, 175, fn. 22; TEB I, 231, § 414, fn., and most recently Kim, 2007b, 68, fn. 7 assume that we have to do with "Kontamination von Ko. VI *päknātär*, Opt. *päknitär* und Ko. III *pkatär* und Opt. *pśitär*?". But since both roots are A-character roots, it is not likely that some subjunctive Class III stem formation had interfered. The only morphologically possible assumption would be that a very old optative made to the root before it was expanded by PT *-nā- survived in Tocharian A and was contaminated with the productive optative. Note also the strange geminated -śś-. Differently, Couvreur, 1947, 74f. assumed that after TA -nā- a TA *-k- was filled in as hiatus glide, and for such a hiatus glide he refers to TG, 38, § 68, and a noun plural such as TA *lwā-k-is* 'animals', TA *(pä)ltwā-käṣ* 'leaves', and TA *puklā-kaṃ* 'years'. Winter, 1965, 206ff. = 2005, 122ff. proposed that -k- (> -ś-) in the optative forms may reflect a former laryngeal.

There are indeed a couple of TA optative formations from roots ending in TA -ā-, which do show what may be explained as a hiatus glide, i.e., optatives in TA -wi- made from roots of the structure [A]*Cā*- (for which see below), so that one may ask why the same strategy was not simply applied to the stems in TA -nā-.

With regard to the similarly irregular TB optatives 3.sg. *käñiyoytär* and *kñyoytar* beside regular *kñitär* (for which see above), the best stragety for TA *päknāśitär* and TA *yäknāśśitär* may indeed be that they are due to some kind of hypercorrection or blend.

---

[6] Note that the Opt of the third TA Sub VI stem from [A]*yom[ä]*- 'achieve' is also irregular inasmuch as it seems to show the old, expected ablaut (TA *yämniṣ*), while all other forms from this root have generalized the ablaut grade TA *yom(n)*-.

23.2.3.   *Optatives in -wi-*

In Tocharian A, roots of the structure ᴬ*Cā*- form optatives in TA *-wi-*, cf. TA *tāwiṣ* from the non-extended stem TA *tā*- 'put', and TA *wāwim* from ᴬ*wā*- 'lead' (the latter alternating with root-final *-y-* in Tocharian TB *wāyⁱ*- 'lead').

Winter, 1962a, 32f. = 1984, 274f. = 2005, 62f. claimed that the *-w-* in such optatives is due to the fact that different glides had been chosen in the two languages to fill the hiatus, and that the TA *-ā-* is due to a contraction of *-āwā- to TA *-ā-* (see also Winter, 1965a, 203ff. = 2005, 128ff.). Hilmarsson, 1994, 101 further pointed out that the *wi*-optative in Tocharian A is likely to be a secondary creation, and as a starting point of the formation he assumed TA *śāwiṣ* to be the only form, where the glide would have been preserved by sound law. Therefore, the unclear Opt TA *skāwiṣ* could belong to *skāyaṣ* from ᴬ*skāyⁱ*- 'strive', as per Hilmarsson, 1994, 101ff. with fn. 5. The root ᴬ*e*- 'give', however, has still the etymologically expected Opt TA *āyi-*. On TA *-w-* as hiatus glide see also Hackstein, 2002a, 229f., fn. 71.

THE PRESENT OF CLASS I

24.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRESENT CLASS I

The following 32 verbs form a present of Class I (15 TB, 27 TA, 11 TB = TA):

i-/ ^Ai- 'go' (TB: Prs I + II), *^Akäln-* 'resound', *^Aken-* 'call' (Prs I + II), *^Akrop^(a)-* 'gather', *kläṅk-* 'doubt', *^Atärm-* 'tremble, be agitated', *träṅk-* 'lament'/ *^Aträṅk-* 'say, speak', *nes-/ ^Anas-* 'be' (Prs I + II), *päkw-* 'rely on, trust', *pälk-/ ^Apälk-* 'shine, appear', *^Apäṣt-* '± call, cheer', *^Apäs-* '± spray, pour (water)', *^Apik^ä-* 'paint, write', *^Apräṅk^ʔ-* 'restrain oneself', *^Aplu-* 'fly, soar', *miw^(a)-* 'tremble, quake', *^Amlok-* '?', *yäp-* 'enter', *yärtt^ä?-/ (^Ayärt^ä?-)* 'drag' (TB: Prs I + II; TA: Prs I/II), *yu^(a)-* 'ripen', *yok-/ ^Ayok-* 'drink', *läṅk-/ ^Aläṅk-* 'hang, dangle', *^Alik^ä-* 'wash', *^Awaly-* 'cover', *^Asäl^(a)-* 'fly, arise', *sälp^ä?-/ ^Asälp^ä-* 'glow' (TB: Prs I + II), *^Asu^ʔ-* 'sew', *^Asuw^(a)-/ ^Aswās^(a)-* 'rain', *smi-/ ^Asmi-* 'smile', *tsip^ʔ-/ ^Atsip^ʔ-* 'dance' (TB: Prs I + II), *tsop^ʔ-/ ^Atsop^ʔ-* 'sting, poke', *^Atspok^ʔ-* 'enjoy (food)'. Unclear are: *kāñm^ʔ-* '± be merry' (Prs I/II), *^Aknäsw^ʔ-* '± approach' (Prs I/II), *^Akru-* '?' (Prs I/II), *^Atäk^ä-* 'touch' (Prs I/II), *nitt^(a)-* 'collapse' (Prs I/V), *^Apārs-* '?' (Prs I/II), *^Ayärt^ä?-* 'drag' (Prs I/II), *wät^ä?-* 'fight' (Prs I/II/VII?), *^Asip^ä-* 'anoint' (Prs I/II), *^Atsārt^ä?-* 'weep' (Prs I/II), *tsik^ä-* (prob. Prs I).

The following Prs I forms are attested in Tocharian B:

	Prs I	Thematized	cf. Sub I
1.sg.act.	*yam*	*nesau*	*preku, yam*
2.sg.act.	*yat, nest, yokt*	—	*rewät*
3.sg.act.	*yokäṃ, yaṃ, nesäṃ/nesa-ñ/ nesam-ne, palkäṃ, miwäṃ, yarttäṃ, salpäṃ, tsipäṃ, tsopaṃ-ne*	—	*prekäṃ*
1.pl.act.	—	*ynem/ynemo, nesem*	*ruwäm, aiymo*
2.pl.act.	*yacer, nescer*	*neścer*	—
3.pl.act.	*nesäṃ, nesam-ne*	*yaneṃ, yärtten-ne, salpeṃ, tsipeṃ*	*parkäṃ*
1.sg.mid.	*pkwamar*	—	*yāmmar*
2.sg.mid.	—	—	*yāmtar*
3.sg.mid.	*klyeñktär* (MQ)/ *klyentär* (MQ), *paktär, tsoptär*	—	*yāmtär*

1.pl.mid.	—	—	*yamamtär*
2.pl.mid.	—	—	—
3.pl.mid.	*pkwantär*	—	*yamantär*
3.du.act	*nesteṃ*	—	—
nt-Part	—	*yneñca*	
m-Part	*tränmane* (MQ), *nesamane/*	*ynemane*	
	nesmane (MQ), *pkwamane,*		
	miwamane, yumāne,		
	yokamane, länkamane,		
	smimane, tsipamane		
Ger/Abs	*yalle, nesalle, pkwalle,*	—	*parkälle*
	yuwalye, yokalle, tsipalle,		
	tsopalle		

A special group among Prs I constitute: *kālāk*ᵃ- 'follow', *pārāk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'prosper', *wālāk*ᵃ- 'stay, abide', *sānāp*ᵃ- 'anoint', on which see chap. Prs III/IV 26.3.

The following Prs I forms are attested in Tocharian A:

	Prs I	Thematized	cf. Sub I
1.sg.act.	*yäm, tränkäm, sälpäm*	*nasam*	*em*
2.sg.act.	*yät, kenät, tränkät, naṣt*	—	*et*
3.sg.act.	*yäṣ, kälnaṣ* (sic)*, kenäṣ, trämäṣ, tränkäṣ,*	—	*eṣ*
	pälkäṣ, päṣṭṣ-äṃ, päṣ/päṣṣ-äṃ, pikäṣ,		
	länkäṣ, naṣ/näṃ		
1.pl.act.	*ymäs, tränkmäś-śi, sälpmäs*	*nasamäs*	—
2.pl.act.	*yäc, naś*	—	—
3.pl.act.	*yiñc, kälniñc, tärmiñc, tränkiñc,*	*keneñc,*	—
	pälkiñc, päṣtiñc, pikiñc, pränkiñc/	*neñc*	
	pränki-ñi, mlokīñc, länkiñc, sliñc,		
	sälpiñc, swiñc, tsipiñc, tsopiñc,		
	tspokiñc		
1.sg.mid.	*kenmār*	—	*pärkmār*
2.sg.mid.	—	—	—
3.sg.mid.	*kentär, kroptär, piktär, yärtär*	—	*tränktär*
1.pl.mid.	—	—	—
2.pl.mid.	—	—	*pärkcär*
3.pl.mid.	*kropäntär, pikäntär*	*kenantär*	*pärkäntär*
nt-Part	*tränkäntāp, walyänt, tsipänt*	—	—
m-Part	*ymāṃ, kälnmāṃ, kropmāṃ, tärmmāṃ,*	—	—
	tränkmāṃ, nasmāṃ päsmāṃ, plumāṃ,		
	länkmāṃ, sälmāṃ, sälpmāṃ, sūmāṃ,		
	smimāṃ, yärtmāṃ		
Ger/Abs	*yäl, kroplyāṃ, tränkäl, nasäl, sul*	—	*tänklune*
Inf	*ytsi, kroptsi, tränktsi, piktsi, yoktsi,*	—	—
	līktsi/lyīktsi, sälptsi		

24.1.1.   *Accent and ablaut*

Unlike the Class I subjunctive, the Class I present shows neither intra-paradigmatic ablaut nor irregular initial accent. It has to be pointed out, however, that precisely those Sub I stems standing beside presents of Class I also never show intra-paradigmatic ablaut or initial accent (*päkw-*, *yok-*).

As is usual at morpheme boundaries, a prop vowel (*)*ä* was inserted between the root and the endings.[1] In closed syllables this -*ä*- is preserved and takes on the accent (3.pl.mid *pkwantär* /päkw-ä́-ntär/). In open syllables the *ä*-vowel when bearing the accent is usually preserved (1.pl.mid. *pkwamar* /päkw-ä́-mār/), but can be deleted in metrical passages, like so many other usually accented *ä*-vowels (for this metrical schwa deletion see in general Winter, 1990, 371 = 2005, 393ff.). Hence, we have the following variation in the *m*-participle: *nesamane* beside *nesmăne* (MQ, metrical). On the other hand, in the 2.sg.act. (*nest*, *yokt*), 2.pl.act. (*nescer*), and 3.sg.mid. (*paktär*, *tsoptär*) forms that also derive from trisyllabic proto-structures the *ä*-vowel has been generally deleted, and, what is more, the accent was further shifted onto the initial surface syllable, so that this is not a similar case of metrical schwa deletion. Winter, 1993, 197ff. = 2005, 441ff. has shown that in these cases we have instead to do with a very early deletion of *ä before dental consonants (including palatalized *c*).

24.1.2.   *Endings and the question of athematic vs. thematic inflection*

There is some debate about the correct inflection of the athematic paradigm due to the fact that not too many forms are attested and that many thematic forms intruded into basically athematic paradigms.

The original ending of the 1.sg. active is TB -*u* beside one single example of 1.sg.act. -*m* in *yam* from *i*- 'go'. In contrast, Tocharian A only has -*äm* in the athematic presents (and also in the athematic subjunctives). Tocharian B could take on the thematic ending -*au*/ older -*e͡u* (*nesau* from *nes*- 'be'). In Prs I of Tocharian B there are only

---

[1] Klingenschmitt, 1994, 396 = 2005, 422, fn. 140 and 1994, 405f. = 2005, 430f. claimed that persistent *ä was due to a reanalysis of the outcome of the 3.pl. active ending *-n̥t(i) > *-än(t'ä) as *-ä-n(t'ä), the *-ä- having finally been introduced into the rest of the paradigm. Older theories about an inherited "semi-thematic" inflection have to be abandoned in any case.

forms with the thematic-looking 1.sg.act. ending *-em* attested, whereas the corresponding athematic Sub I does still show some forms having the genuine athematic 1.pl.act. ending *-äm*. Notably *yām-* shows only thematic-looking endings in the active plural: 1.pl.act. *yamem*, 3.pl.act. *yameṃ*; on the other hand, the middle plural is still clearly athematic: 1.pl.mid. *yamamtär*, 3.pl.mid. *yamantär.*

Schmidt, 1985, 425ff. points out that in contrast to the manuals' presentation the true athematic ending of the TB 3.pl. is *-äṃ*, and not *-eṃ*, which is perfectly correct, though only from a diachronic point of view. Schmidt consequently analyzes all stems showing a 3.pl.act. in *-eṃ* as thematic; however, this is contradicted by, e.g., *yärtt*ʔ*-* 'drag', for which there is now a clearly athematic 3.sg.act. *yarttäṃ* attested beside the thematic-looking 3.pl. *yärtten-ne.* So, one will rather follow the view suggested by TEB I, 197, § 351,1 and 198, § 352,3 of "Analogiebildungen", i.e., that thematic-looking forms could intrude into inherited athematic paradigms. Such a productive thematization is a well-known process, and in the case of Tocharian B it was certainly further triggered by the fact that the athematic 3.sg. and 3.pl. active endings were homonymic. The same thematization took place in Tocharian A. The genuine athematic 3.pl. active ending is TA *-iñc*, the thematic one TA *-eñc*, cf. Hackstein, 1995, 151ff. with ref., and it is precisely the 3. plural of athematic paradigms in both languages that takes on the thematic-looking endings most easily (cf. TA 3.pl.act. *keneñc* and 3.pl.mid. TA *kenantär* vs. otherwise athematic forms).

Consequently, the verbum substantivum is basically athematic, while it, nevertheless, consistently shows thematic-looking 1.sg.act. *nesau* and 1.pl. *nesem*; note that the thematic-looking 1.pl. *nesem* is attested as early as in the paleographically archaic manuscript BM b 4 (see Malzahn, 2007a, 268ff.). On the other hand, the verbum substantivum is the only athematic present stem still showing the use of the old athematic 3.pl. active ending *-äṃ* (otherwise found only in the Class I subjunctive), whereas the rest of the 3.pl. active forms from basically athematic present stems only have *-eṃ*. Finally, 1.pl.act. *-em* and 3.pl.act. *-eṃ* are the only endings attested in the optative at all, although this is a category that also has basically athematic inflection.

24.2. DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

From a synchronic point of view, a zero-grade athematic present stem like TA *pik-* existing beside an *ā*-subjunctive/preterit stem TA *pekā-* with persistent full vowel *-e-* is very odd, because the present stem

apparently lacks A-character, and is hence morphologically a simpler formation than the subjunctive stem, which is very unusual, because the present stem is usually either identical with the subjunctive stem or even more complex. In Tocharian B, the best candidates for such an usual pattern come from the twice attested Ger I *tsikale* from *tsik$^{\ddot{a}}$-* 'form, shape' that taken at face value looks like a Prs I form, and stands beside a Sub V/Pt I stem *tsaikā-* with persistent full vowel in the root as well, and from *miw$^{(a)}$-* 'tremble' (Prs I *miwäṃ* beside Prs XII and Sub V/Pt I stem *maiwā-*). Ringe, 1991, 95 states that the lack of A-character in precisely this present stem shows that the introduction of A-character "has not spread evenly: subjunctive and imperative stems, for example, often seem to have required *-ā- before the present stems in the same paradigm did". Of course one can object that *s*-presents always and *sk*-presents in kausativum paradigms usually lack A-character, and that at least most of the latter are certainly secondary, inner-Tocharian present stem formations, so that the absence of A-character in a present stem associated with an *ā*-subjunctive can be a younger feature and must not necessarily reflect a former non-A-character.

Nevertheless, I think that Ringe is basically right, and that we have to do here with PT root presents that were formed via the *tēzzi* principle on the basis of non-Narten root aorists, and which finally generalized the zero grade of the root that must have been original at least in the 3.pl.act. of that root aorist. As for the fact that in these cases it has been the morphologically less complex (and somewhat more archaic) former present stem that continued to be used as a present stem, and the morphologically more complex (and probably more recent) former present stem in (PT) -*ā*- that became confined to the functions of a subjunctive stem can be easily explained by systematic pressure. Actually, there existed an absolutely huge number of other subjunctive formations in (PT) -*ā*- standing beside respective Pt I formations, and these former presents in (PT) -*ā*- had acquired their status as subjunctives thanks to the fact that beside them, there had existed still more recent, and more complex, present formations in (PT) -*nā*- that actually continued to be used in the primary functions of a present formation.[2]

---

[2] To be honest, there exist also some other instances of a subjunctive being formally more complex than the respective present, e.g., in TA the final outcomes of PT presents in *-Cā/äsk- were presents in -*C(ä)s*- and subjunctives in -*Cās*-. To judge from these cases, I'd like to suggest that what

Finally, I want to point out that the 3.sg. Prs I *tsopaṃ-ne* 'stings'
and also Ger I *tsopalle* are exceedingly interesting forms from an
Indo-Europeanist's point of view, because we clearly have to do here
with a PIE = pre-PT athematic suffixless[3] *o*-grade formation that must
have lacked reduplication (as indicated by the fact that in these two
forms clearly the second syllable from the left bore the accent); these
forms therefore fully confirm Jasanoff's claim that PIE must have had
such formations devoid of reduplication (see, e.g., Jasanoff, 2003,
64ff.), and the semantics also fully fit into Jasanoff's scheme.

---

really mattered was the principle of synchronic productivity: when in
(pre-)PT two different original present formations competed with each other,
fully in accordance with Kuryłowicz's Fourth Law of Analogy the more
recent/productive one took over the primary functions of a present formation,
and the more archaic/less productive/recessive one was confined to the
secondary functions of a (pre-)PT present stem, i.e., the functions of a
subjunctive. Of course in general the more productive and innovative
formations are formally more complex than the respective archaic formations
they inherently tend to replace.

[3] The former *-u- that once must have existed immediately after the root
syllable is, of course, best explained as a post-labial result of a pre-PT *-ä- that
had developed at a strong morpheme boundary, and not as a result of a PIE =
pre-PT *-u- morpheme.

THE PRESENT OF CLASS II

25.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRESENT CLASS II

The following 53 verbs form a thematic present of Class II (42 TB, 25 TA, 14 TB = TA):

āk-/ ᴬāk- 'lead, guide', *aik-* 'know, recognize', *kātk-/ ᴬkātk-* 'rejoice, be glad', *kätt-* 'put, set (down)', *kärsk-* '?', *käln-* 'resound', *käl(t)s-* 'goad', *käly-/ ᴬkäly-* 'stand, be situated', *käs-* act. 'extinguish', mid. 'come to extinction', *kut-* 'avert, eliminate', *kery-* 'laugh', *kauk-* 'call', *kraup⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'gather, assemble', *klāpᵃ-* '± touch; investigate', *klyaus-/ ᴬklyos-* 'hear, listen to', *cäṅk-* 'please', *cämp-/ ᴬcämp-* 'be able to', *cepy-* '?', *ñäsk-* 'demand, desire', *tās-/ ᴬtā(-s)-* act. 'put', mid. 'place oneself; be compared', *ᴬtāsk-* 'resemble', *täk-/ (ᴬtäkᵃ-)* 'touch', *täṅk-* 'hinder', *trāskᵃ-* 'chew', *trus-* 'tear to pieces', *nāsk-* 'bathe, swim', *pāsk-/ ᴬpās-* 'protect, obey', *pättʔ-* '± climb', *pännᵃ-/ ᴬpänwᵃ-* 'stretch, pull (out, up)', *pär-/ ᴬpär-* 'bear', *perkʔ-* 'peer', *ᴬpros-* 'feel ashamed', *plätk-* 'overflow, rise', *mān(t)s⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be sorrowful', *ᴬmiwᵃ-* 'shake', *mely-/ ᴬmalyw-* 'crush, squeeze', *ᴬya(p)-* 'do', *yärs-/ ᴬyärs-* 'show respect, affection', *yäs-* 'excite, touch (sexually)'/ *ᴬyäs-* 'boil', *ᴬräpʔ-* '± make music', *räss⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'tear, pick', *lāṃs-* 'work on, perform', *lyäk-* 'lie', *ᴬwāmpᵃʔ-* 'decorate', *ᴬwäs-* 'put on', *ᴬwras-* 'feel', *ᴬwin-* '?', *ᴬwles-* 'perform', *śāw-/ ᴬśāw-* 'live', *ṣäṃs-* 'count (as)', *ṣäm-/ ᴬṣäm-* 'sit', *soy-* 'become sated', *ᴬspārtw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'turn'.

Uncertain are: *kāñmʔ-* '± be merry' (Prs I/II), *kurᵃʔ-* 'age' (Prs II/III), *ᴬknäswʔ-* '± approach' (Prs I/II), *ᴬkru-* '?' (Prs I/II), *ᴬklu(s)-* 'explain' (Prs II/VIII), *ᴬtäkᵃ-* 'touch' (Prs I/II), *tuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'hide oneself, seek refuge in' (Prs II/III), *ᴬpārs-* '?' (Prs I/II), *ᴬyärtᵃʔ-* 'drag' (Prs I/II), *re(-sk)-* 'flow' (Prs II/IXa), *wätᵃʔ-* 'fight' (Prs I/II/VII?), *wlā(-sk)-* '± exude' (Prs II/IXa), *ᴬsipᵃ-* 'anoint' (Prs I/II); *ᴬtsārtᵃʔ-* 'weep' (Prs I/II).

	TB	TA
1.sg.act.	*kātkau*	*cämpam*
2.sg.act.	—[1]	*cämpät*
3.sg.act.	*kāccäṃ*	*cämpäṣ*
1.pl.act.	*ñäskem*	*ypamäs*
2.pl.act.	*parcer*	*kāckäc*
3.pl.act.	*kātkeṃ*	*ypeñc, tāse*

---

[1] A 2.sg. *śait* (Prs or Sub) is only listed in TochSprR(B), glossary, 177.

1.sg.mid.	*aikemar*	*ypamār*
2.sg.mid.	*aiśtar*	*pāṣtār*
3.sg.mid.	*aiśtär*	*pāṣtär*
1.pl.mid.	*paskemntär*	*ypamtär*
2.pl.mid.	—	—
3.pl.mid.	*aikentär*	*pāsantär*
3.du.mid.	*tasaitär*	—
nt-Part	*aiśeñca*	*pāṣant*
m-Part	*aikemane*	*pāsmāṃ*
Ger/Abs	*aiśalle*	*pāṣäl*
Inf		*pāssi*

Pace TEB I, 199, § 356, fn. 1 (cf. also the paradigm on p. 263), the TA ending of the 2.pl. active is TA *-äc* (the same as in the athematic paradigm); a TA ending †*-ac* is not attested at all in any thematic paradigm.

The thematic Class II presents show the normal accentuation pattern in Tocharian B. The initial accent to be seen in what seem to be synchronically Prs II forms 3.sg. *warṣäm-ne* and *m*-Part *wärskemane* from what looks like a root *wärsk-* 'smell' is easily explained by deriving the seeming root from a present stem in *-äsk-*, i.e., **wär-äsk-* with two syllables; see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.6.2.2.

25.1.1.   *Depalatalization of the root final*

Present Class II shows an inherited thematic inflection, so that persons containing the reflex of the pre-PT suffix allomorph *-e-* show palatalization of a palatalizable root final. On the other hand, such palatalized forms in front of endings beginning with °*t* may be depalatalized, cf. the special case of the thematic infinitive in °*tsi* made from the thematic subjunctive stem of Class II (see chap. Sub II 19.1.3.). The only certain example of depalatalization in a Prs II is actually the 3.sg. *kaltär* (attested a couple of times) from *käly-* 'stand'.

25.1.2.   *Preservation of ä before °t in Tocharian B*

As Winter, 1993, 197ff. = 2005, 441ff. has shown, the suffix vowel *-ä-* was lost early before endings beginning with a dental, hence we have a 3.sg.mid. such as *ñaṣtär* < **ñäs'k'ätär* with accent retraction onto the root syllable. There are just two seeming exceptions to that rule (the same is true for subjunctives of Class II; see chap. Sub II 19.1.2.): 3.sg.mid. Prs II *peññatär* (Š, prose) from *pänn^ä-* 'stretch'; 3.sg.mid. Prs

II *melyätär* (MQ, metrical) from *mely-* 'crush' with surfacing (*)*ä* as in Sub II Inf *melyatsi*; but note that we are dealing here with PIE *-ei̯e/o- presents, in which *-ei̯e- should have resulted by sound law in PT *-'æ-.

25.1.3. *Irregular syncope of the suffix in Tocharian A*

TA *m*-participles such as TA *tāsmāṃ* show the expected loss of TA *-a-* after full vowel due to vowel balance; as for roots with non-full root vowel, TA *cämpamāṃ* shows the expected preservation of the suffix TA *-a-* < PT *-æ-;[2] but the *m*-participles TA *pärmāṃ*, TA *kälymāṃ*, TA *yärsmāṃ*, and the 1.pl. forms TA *kälymār* and TA *yärsmār* seem to show an unexpected loss of the thematic vowel; see Winter, 1991, 51ff. = 2005, 428ff. Note that forms like the 1.pl.act. TA *tāsamäs* or 1.pl.mid. *pañwamtär* show regular preservation of TA *-a-* before an ending containing TA *-ä-* (cf. TEB I, 43, § 11,3,c).[3] There are different explanations available for what seems to be an irregular loss of the thematic vowel in these forms. Winter, l.c., claims a different accent pattern to be responsible for the outcome of the suffix vowel (with quite a few cases of analogical leveling), which is, however, a somewhat circular scenario. Such seeming cases with pre-TA (apparently non-palatalizing) *-ä- instead of expected *-a- may also be due to a kind of progressive, informal-style weakening (as per Peters, 2006, 345, fn. 48), or just be due to analogical introduction of *-ä- from forms built from roots with full root vowel (which prevail in this class). Finally, one should also think of the possibility that some of these cases might have preserved a former athematic inflection; cf. esp. the case of *käly-*.

25.2. Diachronic Treatment

There can be no doubt that Tocharian inherited the usual kind of thematic inflection from PIE, because Tocharian shows the expected

---

[2] TA *mlamāṃ* rather belongs to a Prs III stem; see s.v. ᴬ*mäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'being crushed'.

[3] The likewise irregular loss of the thematic vowel in the 1.pl. Pt I of the verbum substantivum TA *tākmäs* from ᴬ*tākᵃ-* 'be, become' (cf. TEB I, 47, § 11,3,c, fn. 3) is somewhat matched by the irregular loss of stem-final TA *-ā-* in the 2.sg. Ipv TA *päṣtāk-ñi* from the same root. Since this is a verb of high frequency, one may toy with the idea of a progressive sound change.

interchange between the thematic vowels *-ä-/o- > palatalizing *-ä-/
non-palatalizing *-æ- in many stem patterns. Nevertheless, some
scholars found it quite remarkable that we do not find too many Prs II
or Sub II formations in Tocharian with the thematic vowel attached to
a bare PIE root. Actually, such a Prs II (but no cognate Sub II) is
attested from the following roots (the respective subjunctives are
always provided by stems from a different root):

[AB]āk- 'lead, guide, drive': from PIE *(H)aĝ-e/o- (suppletive stem
wāy[a]-/ [A]wā-); [AB]käly- 'stand, be situated': from PIE *ḱlei̯-e/o-
(suppletive stem stäm[(ä)]-/[A]ṣtäm[(ä)]-); [A]ken- 'call': etymology uncertain
(suppletive stem [A]kāk[a]-); kauk- 'call': maybe from *ḱēu̯k-e/o-
(suppletive stem kāk[a]-); [AB]pär- 'bear, carry, take': from PIE *bʰer-e/o-[4]
(suppletive stems [AB]kām[a]-, ai-, ās-); ṣäm- 'sit, remain': maybe
ultimately from *√sed with introduction of -m- in analogy to the
suppletive subjunctive stem (= [AB]läm[(ä)]-).[5]

See on this subject above all Jasanoff, 1998, 314f., and esp. Ringe,
2000, 121ff., who finally comes to the conclusion that the rareness of
simple thematic stems speaks in favor of Frühausgliederung of the
Tocharian branch, being another common feature with Anatolian that
he says lacks such thematic indicatives or subjunctives altogether. In
contrast, Rasmussen, 2002, 380ff. points out that the apparent scarcity
of simple thematic stems in Tocharian may merely be due to non-
productivity. And indeed, whereas it was the simple thematic type
that became productive in many daughter languages, in Tocharian
obviously the more complex thematic present stem formations turned

---

[4] Kim, 2006, 133f. states: "das unerwartete Fehlen anlautender
Palatalisierung nicht nur in Präsensstämmen der VIII. Klasse, sondern auch
unter den wenigen einfachen thematischen Präsentia (Kl. II) ist noch nicht
geklärt. Hackstein (1995:159-65 und passim) hat ursprüngliche Nullstufe in s-
Präsentien vorgeschlagen, andere Möglichkeiten sind aber auch denkbar (so
zu Recht Penney 1996[recte: 1998]:93-4). Nach Ringe (1996:141-2) wurde
anlautendes *pʸ- im Präsens uridg. *bʰer- > *pʸər- → urtoch. *pər- (sonst
würde *pʸər- im Westtoch. „pir-" ergeben) analogisch entpalatalisiert, aber
nach welchem Vorbild?". As is argued in chap. Sound Laws 1.7., TB pär- may
derive from e-grade *bʰer-e/o- by sound law. As is further shown below in the
main text, most thematic present and subjunctive stems that can be derived
from PIE *bʰer-e/o- type formations indeed show the expected palatalization;
see also chap. Sub II 19.1.5.

[5] Prs II [A]ya(p)- 'do' is maybe just synchronically a suppletive stem of
[A]yām-, because diachronically both Toch. roots can be derived from one single
PIE root; see Peters, 2004, 434.

productive. The Prs II stems mentioned above are therefore archaisms. To be sure, the most productive present stem classes are, in fact, precisely thematic classes: Class VIII in PT *-s'ä/sæ-, Class IX in PT *-s'k'ä/skæ-, and also the denominative Class XII, which derived from *-i̯e/o- stems.

There further exists an obvious pattern with respect to the root ablaut of Class II presents: if a present made from a root with a non-full root vowel is matched with a Sub II from the same root, both categories show a palatalizing PT *ä*-grade < pre-PT *e*-grade. On the other hand, if the Prs II is associated with a different subjunctive stem formation (with any kind of root vowel), it is prone to have a PT *æ*-grade in the present, which in most cases also palatalizes the root initial (pointing to a pre-PT *ē*-grade); cf. the examples in the following table (I only list TB forms; respective TA present stems show the same picture):

käs- (II/I-III/III): *keṣäṃ*	*cänk-* (II/IoII/-): *cäñśäṃ* *√tenĝ/g
kauk- (II/-/-): *śauśäṃ*	*cämp-* (II/II/I): *campäṃ* *√temp
kraup^(a)- (II-VI/II-V/I): *krauptär*	*ñäsk-* (II/II/I-II): *ñäṣṣäṃ* *nes-sk̂e/o-
klāp^a- (II-VI/V/I): *klyeptär*	*yärs-* (II/II/I): *yarṣtär*
täk- (II/I/III): *ceśäṃ*	*yäs-* (II/II/-): *yaṣtär* *√i̯es
tänk- (II-VIII/I/III): *cenkeṃ*	*lyäk-* (II/II/-): *lyaśäṃ* *√legʰ
trāsk^a- (II/V/-): *treṣṣäṃ*	*ṣäms-* (II/II/I): *ṣamṣtär* *√(s)k̂ens
plätk- (II/I/III): *plyetkemane*	
mān(t)s^(a)- (II-VI/II-V/I): *memṣtär*	

The only counterexamples are provided by *räss^(a)-* (II/V/I) with *räṣṣiṃ* and *pänn^a-* (II/V/I) with *päññän-me.*

Judged by this pattern, the ambiguous subjunctive stem of *cänk-* was rather one of Class II than Class I.

The following Class II present stems show a palatalizing full vowel in the root that is apparently to be derived from pre-PT *-ē-:
kauk- 'call': 3.sg. *śauśäṃ*, 3.pl.mid. *śaukentär*, etc.; *klāp^a-* '± touch; investigate': 3.sg.mid. *klyeptär*, 3.pl.mid. *klyepentär*; *täk-/* (^A*täk^a-*) 'touch': 3.sg. *ceśäṃ*, 3.pl. *ceken-ne* (TA *ckeñc*), etc.; *tänk-* 'hinder': 3.sg. *cenkeṃ*, 3.sg.mid. *cemṣtär*; *plätk-* 'overflow, develop': *m*-Part *plyetkemane.*

There can be little doubt that also the Ger I TA *waṣlaṃ* from ^A*wäs-* 'don, wear' has a vowel -*a*- that derives from a pre-PT *ē.[6]

The only seeming example for non-palatalizing *æ*-grade is *käs-* 'quench, come to extinction' with 3.sg. *keṣäṃ*, etc., and accordingly

---

[6] Note that a pre-PT *ē*-grade is also met in the Sub II from *litk^(a)?-* 'remove'.

Widmer, 1998, 174 derives this from a pre-PT *o*-grade in the root, but see Jasanoff, 1998, 314, fn. 53; 2003, 200, fn. 44; 2008, 159 for an original status as Prs VIII.

Ambiguous with respect to palatalization are:
*trāsk*ᵃ- 'chew' (probably ultimately from PIE *tr̥h₃ĝ-sk̂e/o-): 3.sg. *treṣṣäṃ*; *mān(t)s*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be sorrowful': 3.sg.mid. *memṣtär*, 3.pl.mid. *memsentär*; maybe *re(-sk)-* 'flow' also belongs here with 3.sg. *reṣṣäṃ*, etc., from which only the present stem is attested (either a Prs II or Prs IXa); similarly, *perk*ʔ- 'peer', from which also only the present form 3.pl.mid. *perkentär-me* is attested. *pänn*ᵃ- 'stretch' with 3.sg.mid. *peññatär* (Š, sic) beside 3.sg.act. *päññän-me* (MQ) and 3.pl.act. Imp *päññīyeṃ* is a special problem; see above 25.1.2.

Pre-PT *ē*-grade is also attested in Class III presents such as *ñewetär* from *nu*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'cry', and *lyewetär* from *lu*ᵃ- 'send'; and although these roots also ultimately show Narten character, I claim that such Prs III forms are not directly based on athematic Narten presents, but to be compared with the type Latin *cēlāre* (see chap. Prs III/IV 26.5.3.).

On the other hand, this is certainly precisely the claim to be made for the Prs II forms showing a root vowel pre-PT *ē. As far as I can see, there is no viable alternative to taking them for secondarily thematized singular active stem allomorphs of PIE > pre-PT athematic Narten present or PIE athematic Narten preterit stems (some of which ended up as still athematic Sub I stems). The best example with respect to evidence from other branches is probably furnished by TA *waṣlaṃ* < pre-PT *u̯ēs-, since there no doubt existed a PIE Narten middle present *u̯es-toi̯ which, of course, would go extremely well together with a respective 3.sg.act. *u̯ēs-ti.[7] *cepy-* may attest to yet another way of creating singular active stem allomorphs of thematized Narten stems, viz. by adding *-i̯e/o-. If this is correct, then a Prs I †*klyeṅk-* standing beside a Sub I *kläṅk-* can simply be taken for an archaism.

---

[7] See also the remarks by Peters, 2006, 332ff. on the occasion of Prs II = Sub II *klyaus-/ ᴬklyos-*, who, however, thought that Prs II and Sub II formations with pre-PT *ē*-grade derived from subjunctives to Narten verbal stems, and that the pre-PT *ē*-grade instead of the expected pre-PT *e*-grade of the root was analogically introduced from the singular active indicative forms of the same Narten stems. But such an analysis would require, of course, the assumption that PIE subjunctives were not lost entirely in pre-PT times.

THE PRESENT OF CLASSES III AND IV

26.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRESENT CLASSES III AND IV

26.1.1. *Class III present forms*

The following 47 roots form a present of Class III (35 TB, 26 TA, 14 TB = TA):

kurpᵃ- 'care', *kulʸᵃ-/ ᴬkulʸᵃ-* 'recede', *kulypᵃ-/ ᴬkulypᵃ-* 'desire', *krämp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be hindered, disturbed', *ᴬtäpᵃ-* '?', *trik⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬtrik⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'go astray, be confused', *triw⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬtriw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be mixed, shaken', *nu⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cry', *ᴬpärkᵃ-* '(a)rise', *ᴬpärsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be afraid', *ᴬpäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'come to extinction', *pälk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'burn', *pränk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'restrain oneself, keep away', *prutk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be shut', 'be filled', *plänk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'come up for sale, *mänk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be inferior, lack', *märs⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'forget', *ᴬmäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'being crushed, pressed together', *mäskᵃ-/ ᴬmäsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be, become', *mätstsᵃ-/ ᴬnätsw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'starve', *mit⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'set out, go, come', *musk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'disappear, perish', *mlutkᵃ-* 'escape'/~ *ᴬmluskᵃ-* 'escape', *ᴬyätkᵃ-* '?', *ᴬyu⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'turn, incline towards', *ᴬyutkᵃ-* 'be worried', *ritt⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬritw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be attached to; be suitable', *ᴬlit⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'fall, move away', *lipᵃ-* 'remain, be left over', *luᵃ-* 'send', *luk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'light up, be illuminated', *ᴬwätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'separate, be separated, be decided', *wäks⁽ᵃ⁾-* '± turn away', *ᴬwäpᵃ-* '?', *wik⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬwik⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'disappear', *śärsᵃ-* '?', *ᴬśurᵃ-* 'be concerned', *sätk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬsätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'spread out', *ᴬsik⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be overflown', *siyᵃ-* 'sweat', *spänt⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬspäntᵃ-* 'trust', *spärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'disappear, perish', *srukᵃ-* 'die', *tsänkᵃ-* '(a)rise', *tsäm⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬtsäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'grow, increase, come into being', *tsär⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬtsär⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be separated', *tsälp⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬtsälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pass away, be released, redeemed', *tsuw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'attach oneself, stick to'.

Uncertain are: *kurᵃ?-* 'age', (Prs II/III), *tuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'hide oneself, seek refuge in' (Prs II/III), *ᴬtsāltᵃ-* '± devour' (?).

	TB	TA		TB	TA
1.sg.mid.	*mäskemar*	*mäskamār*	1.pl.mid.	*mäskemtär*	—
2.sg.mid.	*mäsketar*	*mäskatār*	2.pl.mid.	*späntetär*	*śuracär*
3.sg.mid.	*mäsketär*	*mäskatär*	3.pl.mid.	*mäskentär*	*mäskantär*

	TB	TA
nt-Part	*mäskeñca*	*mskantāsac*
m-Part	*mäskemane*	*mäskamāṃ*
Ger/Abs	*mäskelle*	*mäskal*
Inf		*mäskatsi*

In both languages a present of Class III is usually made from roots with non-full root vowel (*ä, i, u*), whereas a present of Class IV is formed from roots with full root vowel (*ā, au*/TA *o, ai*/TA *e*).[1] In Tocharian A, the suffix vowel in Class IV is subject to the usual weakening process triggered by vowel balance.

This definition implies, of course, that in contrast to the manuals and in accordance with Jasanoff, 1978, 44, I prefer to assign the present stems of the non-full vowel roots *ᴬmlusk*ᵃ*-* 'escape' (Prs TA *mloskatär*),[2] *ᴬpärsk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* (Prs TA *praska-*), *ᴬtsäm*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* (Prs TA *śama-*), and *ᴬtsälp*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* (Prs TA *śalpa-*) to Class III and not to Class IV, given that the corresponding TB presents made from the related roots belong to Class III, and also because the palatalized root-initial consonants of TA *śama-* and TA *śalpa-* apparently point to a pre-PT *ē ablaut vowel, so that we are dealing with lengthened-grade formations of the TB Prs III type *ñewe-*. As for the hapax 3.pl. TA *śalcantär*, which shows palatalization of both the root-initial and root-final consonant, Winter, 1976a, 29 = 2005, 165 argues that the root is the same as the one attested by TB *tsālt*ᵃ*-* 'chew', and that we are dealing with a Prs IV of a respective root *ᴬtsālt*ᵃ*-* '± devour'. However, Class IV presents never show root-initial palatalization, so that one would like to toy with the idea that *ś-* here is just due to palatalization assimilation: pre-PT *doltei̯e/o- > PT *ts'ælt'- (cf. TA *ckācar* vs. TB *tkācer*). As for the unusual root-final palatalization, a parallel is provided by the Prs IV stem TA *sparcwa-* from *ᴬspārtw*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'turn', which goes back to an *-ei̯e/o- present; see below 26.5.3. All in all, Winter's interpretation of TA *śalcantär* makes sense semantically (see s.v. *tsālt*ᵃ*-* 'chew'), but TA *śalcantär* may not belong here at least from a diachronic point of view, i.e., it may likewise go back to an *-ei̯e/o- present; see below 26.5.3.

---

[1] The only exception seems to be Prs IV *laitotär* from *lit*ᵃ*-* 'fall'. *laitotär* has a Sub V with persistent full grade *laitā-* and two preterit-stem allomorphs *litā-* and *laitā-* at its side, so that *laito-* is a normal Prs stem beside *laitā-*; but note the related Prs III stem TA *lita-*.

[2] This form also stands beside an ablauting Sub V. Note further that we cannot totally exclude the possibility that TA *mloskatär* belongs to a different root (the passage is fragmentary), or that the form is a Sub II or V (with an *-o-* unexpected here as well).

26.1.2.   Class IV present forms

The following 25 roots form a present of Class IV (21 TB, 13 TA, 9 TB =
TA):

ār⁽ä⁾-/ ᴬār⁽ä⁾- cease, come to an end', *ārt(t)⁽ä⁾-/ ᴬārt^ä-* 'be pleased with, love,
praise', *āl⁽ä⁾-* '± be restrained', *ās⁽ä⁾-/ ᴬās⁽ä⁾-* 'dry (out)', *aiw⁽ä⁾-* 'be turned toward,
incline to', *kārp⁽ä⁾-* 'descend', *krās⁽ä⁾-* 'be angry', *klāy^ä-/ ᴬklāw^ä-* 'fall', *klāw⁽ä⁾-* 'be
called, named', *klaiks^ä-* 'dry up, wither; be afflicted', *klautk⁽ä⁾-* 'turn, become',
trāpp^ä-/ ᴬtrāp^ä- 'trip', *paut^ä-/ ᴬpot^ä-* 'honor, flatter', *plānt⁽ä⁾-/ ᴬplānt⁽ä⁾-* 'rejoice,
be glad', *ᴬpyāṣṭ⁽ä⁾-* 'be strong, be nourished', *yāṅk⁽ä⁾-* 'be deluded', *yāt⁽ä⁾-/ ᴬyāt⁽ä⁾-*
'be (cap)able', *lit^ä-* 'fall (down, off), abandon, move away', *wāk⁽ä⁾-* 'split apart,
bloom', *ᴬwāṅk^ä-* 'chat', *śamp^ä-* 'be conceited', *ᴬsāk⁽ä⁾-* 'remain', *spārtt⁽ä⁾-/
ᴬspārtw⁽ä⁾-* 'turn, behave, be', *spāw⁽ä⁾-* 'subside, diminish', *ᴬtsārw⁽ä⁾-* 'be
comforted, take heart'.
Unclear is: *ᴬtsālt^ä-* '± devour' (?).

	TB	TA		TB	TA
1.sg.mid.	*plontomar*	*artmār*	1.pl.mid.	—	—
2.sg.mid.	*klaiksotar*	*planttār*	2.pl.mid.	—	—
3.sg.mid.	*plontotär*	*potatär*	3.pl.mid.	*plontontär*	*plantantär*

	TB	TA
nt-Part	—	?[3]
m-Part	*sporttomane*	*plaṃtmāṃ*
Ger/Abs	*sporttolle*	*artal*
Inf		*plantatsi*

26.1.3.   Uncertain Prs III/IV forms, or incorrectly analyzed ones

TEB I, 201, §§ 360f. also analyzes the present stems of *kery-* 'laugh' and
tās- 'put' (*tasaitär* "für *tasetär*", *tasemane*) as Class III stems, and that
of *ᴬtāsk-* 'resemble' as Class IV stem, but see the discussion s.v. *kery-*
'laugh', *tās-* 'put', and *ᴬtāsk-* 'resemble'. The restoration to a Prs III
ly(u)weträ from *lyu-* 'rub' (thus WTG, 285) in 514 b 4 is uncertain; see
s.v. *lu^ä-* 'send'. That *śowota* in 143 a 5 (MQ) contains a Prs IV 3.sg.
śowot<rä> or 2.sg. *śowota<r>* (as proposed by TochSprR(B), s.v.,
followed by Adams, DoT, 635, s.v. *śow-*) remains possible, but is
uncertain. Finally, Schmidt, 1974, 33, fn. 2 puts *ᴬtsārt^ä?-* 'weep' on his
list of Prs III/IV roots, but see the discussion s.v. *ᴬtsārt^ä?-* 'weep'.

---

[3] On TA *sparcwäntāśśi*, see below 26.2.2. with fn. 9.

26.1.4.   *Root ablaut in Prs III*

Present III forms usually have non-palatalizing -*ä*- as root vowel. Some forms have a palatalizing root vowel -*e*-/ TA -*a*- apparently from pre-PT *ē, and there are also palatalized forms from what seem pre-PT *e*-grades, and probably one or two cases with non-palatalizing PT *æ, i.e., pre-PT *o.

26.1.4.1.   *Palatalizing PT *æ in the root*

The following examples show a palatalizing *'æ as root vowel: *nu*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'cry' with 3.sg. Prs *ñewetär*; *lu*ᵃ̊- 'send' with 3.sg. Prs *lyewetär*; ᴬ*tsäm*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'grow' with 3.pl. Prs TA *śamantär*; ᴬ*tsälp*ᵃ̊- 'pass away' with 3.sg. Prs TA *śalpatär.*

It is possible, but not certain, that 3.pl. Prs TA *śalcantär* from ᴬ*tsält*ᵃ̊- '± devour' belongs here as well;[4] the TA present stem *śert*- does not belong to this group, see s.v. ᴬ*tsārt*ᵃ̊ʔ- 'weep'. Finally, TA *praskatär*, etc. from ᴬ*pärsk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be afraid' (to which TB responds with a Prs V) must belong either here or to forms discussed in the following paragraph. Most likely also *tsäṅk*ᵃ̊- 'arise' with 3.sg. Prs *tseṅketär*, etc. reflects *'æ in the root (as per TEB I, 64, § 41 and 200, § 359,2), because TB *ts*- seems to be the regular outcome of *ts'; see chap. Sound Laws 1.2. Note that *tsäṅk*ᵃ̊- behaves similarly to *nu*⁽ᵃ⁾-, *lu*ᵃ̊-, and also to *luk*⁽ᵃ⁾- by showing irregular behavior in the subjunctive stem (see below 26.2.5.). If the present goes back to non-palatalized *tsænk-, it may have a parallel in TA *mloskatär* from ᴬ*mlusk*ᵃ̊- 'escape'.

26.1.4.2.   *Palatalizing PT *ä in the root*

Here belong: ᴬᴮ*kulyp*ᵃ̊- 'desire' (see Adams, DoT, 185 for "*kwlyäp-"); *luk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'light up' with 3.sg. *lyuketär*; in my opinion, TA *śralune* is a similarly palatalized *ä*-grade Prs III stem from ᴬ*tsär*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be separated', see s.v. ᴬ*tsär*⁽ᵃ⁾-. Whether the restoration to a 3.sg. Prs *ly(u)wetär* from *lu*ʔ- 'rub' is correct is very uncertain, see s.v. *lu*ʔ- 'rub' and *lu*ᵃ̊- 'send'.

Whether the 1.sg. Prs *cukemar* from *tuk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'hide oneself' also belongs here is uncertain as well, because the form may as well be a Class II present (examples with root-initial palatalization are attested in this present class). The analysis depends on the correct interpretation of the possible subjunctive form 1.sg.act. *taukau* (see

---

[4] This hapax is semantically uncertain, and so is a connection with the root *tsält*ᵃ̊- 'chew'; see the discussion above 26.1.1. and s.v. ᴬᴮ*tsālt*ᵃ̊-.

s.v. *tuk*[(a)]- 'hide'). As for the variation of 3.sg. Prs *lipetär* and *lyīpetär*
from *lip*[ä]- 'remain', the same variation is also found in the preterit. As
for the Prs III TA *śuratär*, present-stem forms are the only attested
verbal forms from this root, but as Winter, 1980, 439 = 2005, 221 points
out correctly, the noun TA *śurām* 'sorrow' presupposes a subjunctive
stem TA *śurā-*, so that one has to set up a root with a palatal initial
[A]*śur*[ä]- 'be concerned', undoubtedly of denominative origin.

26.2.   VOICE/VALENCY PATTERNS OF PRS III/IV VERBS

Present Classes III and IV are parallel formations inasmuch as they are
basically correlated with similar stem formations, and share a lot of
morphological and morphosyntactical characteristics. Both classes
seem to be in complementary distribution with respect to root
vocalism: roots with basic root vowel *ä*, *i*, or *u* form a Class III present,
roots with root vowel *ā*, *ai*/TA *e*, *au*/TA *o* a present of Class IV, and
(*)-*ā*-, -*o*- are not allowed to act as a root vowel in Class III Prs in
Tocharian B, cf. TEB 200f., §§ 359, 363.

Verbs forming a present of Class III or IV have the following
general characteristics:

They always form one paradigm together with a Class V
subjunctive, and almost always also with a Class I preterit; they are
usually intransitive; they can only be part of a grundverb paradigm,
viz. they are never part of a kausativum or antigrundverb paradigm,
and they are often part of a grundverb paradigm from a triple verb, or
at least of a grundverb paradigm standing beside a kausativum
paradigm; they are media tantum in the present, but usually activa
tantum in the preterit; the preterit usually does not have root-initial
palatalization; the imperfect suffix -*i*- in Tocharian B does not
palatalize,[5] and in Tocharian A, imperfects from Class III/IV present
stems are completely absent, the category to be (functionally) supplied
by preterit stem formations.[6]

---

[5] This fact was, as far as I see, first pointed out by Hackstein, 2004, 89, fn.
14.

[6] This is especially clear in the case of TA *klawrä* in YQ 5 a 6 from *klāw*[ä]-
'fall', which is intransitive and acts as an imperfect judging by the correlated
imperfect form TA *ypār*. We have to do with an old (intransitive!) *s*-preterit
stem formation standing beside the well-attested (intransitive) Pt I 3.sg. TA
klā, 3.pl. TA *klār*.

Nevertheless, there are two remarkable differences between Classes III and IV with respect to paradigmatic affiliation, and one of the two also goes together with a noticeable difference in behavior of Tocharian B versus A.

On the one hand, Class III presents are usually associated with Class I preterits of Subclass 2/3, and Class IV presents usually go together with Class I preterits of Subclass 5, which mostly had a completely different prehistory from that of Subclass 2/3, as I argue in chap. Pt I 7.3.4..

On the other hand, the Sub V paradigms associated with Prs IV are usually activa tantum and of the invariant kind, showing no ablaut, but having persistent (*)-$\bar{a}$- as root vowel in both languages, and constant word-initial accent in Tocharian B. It is with respect to the Sub V paradigms associated with Prs III that the two languages show a radically different behavior: In Tocharian B, these Sub V are usually media tantum, have only *$\ddot{a}$ as root vowel, and lack word-initial accent; in Tocharian A, the respective Sub V are activa tantum and show a root ablaut PT *$\ae$ vs. PT *$\ddot{a}$, which is an inflectional type attested in Tocharian B as well, but there usually only beside Class I preterits of Subclass 1/4.

26.2.1. *Transitive Prs III/IV verbs*

Very few verbs with a Class III or IV present stem are transitive, cf. TEB I, 200, § 359,4 and 202, § 363,4; Schmidt, 1974, 34f. with fn. 1. TEB gives the following examples for transitive presents of Class III and IV: $\bar{a}rt(t)^{(a)}$-/$^A\bar{a}rt^{a}$- 'preisen'; TA *karyaṣ* "verlacht"; $^{AB}kulyp^{a}$- 'verlangen'; "AB *klāw-* 'verkünden'; "und wahrscheinlich AB *yāṅk-* 'betören'".

To be sure, 3.sg. TA *karyaṣ* is rather a subjunctive (see s.v. $^{A}kary$- 'laugh'). As for the grundverb of $klāw^{(a)}$- 'be called, named', the TB paradigm, which has a Class IV present, is intransitive, whereas the valency and stem formation of the corresponding $^{A}klāw^{a}$- 'be called; announce; recite' is very uncertain (see s.v. $^{A}klāw^{a}$-), but most probably does not constitute an example of a transitive Prs III/IV verb at all. The two attested finite forms of the grundverb of $^{AB}yāṅk^{(a)}$- 'be deluded' are unclear with respect to valency, so that I would hesitate to set up transitive valency for that verb at all (see s.v. $^{AB}yāṅk^{(a)}$-). As for $wāp^{a}$- 'weave' brought into the discussion by Schmidt, 1974, 34f., fn. 1, no certain present forms are attested, as concluded by Schmidt himself (see also s.v. $wāp^{a}$- 'weave').

The only Prs III/IV verbs that are indeed transitive are *ārt(t)^(ā)*-/ *^Aārt^ā*- 'be pleased with', *^Akulyp^ā*- 'desire', *lu^ā*- 'send', and *märs^(ā)*- 'forget', and it is certainly not by chance that the corresponding TA present stem of *märs^(ā)*- is made from a different stem class.[7]

ārt(t)^(ā)-/*^Aārt^ā*- shows the further peculiarity that it is medium tantum through the whole paradigm in Tocharian A and B, and even in the Kausativum III (which is transitive like the grundverb, but has the different meaning 'acknowledge'). Since the (none too certain) 3.sg. TA *artär* should not show syncope of the stem final *-ā- if the form is to be analyzed as a Prs IV,[8] one may toy with the idea of assigning this form to a Prs I, which, however, would not make much sense morphologically.

In the case of *kulyp^ā*- 'desire', no finite present forms are attested at all, so that the valency can, strictly speaking, not be determined. In Tocharian A, 3.sg. Prs TA *kulypatär* in A 254 b 5 can only be transitive: A 254 b 5 *poñcäṃ saṃsāraṃ mā cmol kulypatär mā ////*. Schmidt, 1974, 146f. interprets this form (and implicitly that of A 355 b 2) as passive: "Im ganzen Saṃsāra wird nicht [mehr?] Geburt verlangt, nicht ..."; in any case, the form cannot be intransitive. The other passages are unclear and/or too fragmentary.

^ABlu^ā- 'send' belongs to the group of ablauting Sub V stems correlated with a Subcl. 1 (in TB), respectively Subcl. 4 Pt I (in TA), which usually have a nasal present beside them, so that the occurrence of Prs III in Tocharian B is very irregular, and consequently Winter assumed a secondary creation. On the other hand, the apparent lengthened grade of Prs III *lyewe*- would be odd in a secondary form.

As for *märs^(ā)*-/*^Amärs^ā*- 'forget', which has a Prs III in Tocharian B, but Prs VI in Tocharian A, Winter, 1980, 430, 437f. = 2005, 212, 219f. again claims that the TB Class III present stem is secondary, whereas the opposite is held by Schmidt, 1974, 34, fn. 1.

Finally, one has to add *nu^(ā)*- 'cry' to the group of transitive Prs III/IV verbs (in Tocharian A only the kausativum is attested). The grundverb is transitive, as is clear from the *ā*-preterit found in 224 a 3 (MQ): *metär pontäṃts kärtseṣc nawatai* "[als] du freundschaftliche

---

[7] No certain present form of *^Alu^ā*- 'send' is attested, however, the restoration to a 1.pl. nasal present TA *lun(āmäs)* of this root in A 349 a 2 (as per TG, 466, followed by Schmidt, 1974, 45 with fn. 6) makes good sense.

[8] Schmidt, 1974, 260 reckons with a misspelling, but I am not sure that we are not dealing with a metrical passage.

Gesinnung zum Heil aller gebrüllt hast" (Schmidt, 1974, 98); the Prs III itself is attested with an infinitive complement in K 3 b 6 *yolo yāmtsi ñewetär*, according to Sieg, 1938, 13f. "Böses zu tun androht". The Opt *nuwoyt
rä* in fragment 236 1 a 2 is without context. As is the case with *ārt(t)⁽ᵃ⁾-/ᴬārtᵃ-* 'be pleased with', *nu⁽ᵃ⁾-* has the peculiarity that it also has active forms and initial accent in the subjunctive, and middle forms in the preterit stem. Further, just like *lu⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'send' it has a lengthened-grade present stem *ñewe-*.

26.2.2.   *Active forms and the nt-participle*

Although all manuals acknowledge that Class III and IV are almost exclusively inflected in the middle, they list a few active forms as well, cf. TEB I, 200, § 359,3; 202, § 363,3 and Schmidt, 1974, 33, fn. 5, which are in most diachronic approaches taken as "analogical innovations" (thus, e.g., Ringe, 1991, 83, fn. 63).

To be sure, in my opinion, all alleged examples of active Class III/IV forms cited so far are to be rejected or are, at least, so uncertain that I would hesitate to analyze them as active Class III/IV forms at all. For a start, none of the *nt*-participles prove anything with respect to voice, because the present participle is entirely detached from voice in Tocharian (see chap. Prs Part 36.1.); but note that, interestingly enough, in Tocharian B almost no *nt*-participles are attested from athematic stems (Classes I, V, VI, VII) at all, and the same is true for present Classes III/IV. The only attestation of an *nt*-participle formed to a Class III/IV present stem in Tocharian B is *mäskeñca* from the very frequent root *mäskᵃ-* 'be'. As for Tocharian A, three *nt*-participles are attested from present Class III, and only one possible example from Prs IV,[9] which tallies with the fact that in Tocharian A, *nt*-participles to athematic stem classes are generally found a bit more often than in Tocharian B, but are still far less frequent there than *m*-participles.

As for alleged finite active present Class III/IV forms listed in TEB, the roots *kery-/ ᴬkary-* 'laugh' and *ᴬya(p)* 'do' do not form a Class III present at all.

Furthermore, the restored active TA *ri(t)w(e)ñc* in A 220 a 2 can either be a present or a subjunctive form (cf. TG, 462): *cami ri(t)w(e)ñc yärkäntwaṃ ṣñi kāswaṣiṃ ākālyo* "they will be attached with

---

[9] TA *sparcwäntāśśi* 'of the (well)-behaving' from *ᴬspārtw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'turn, behave' can as likely belong to the Prs II stem.

reverence and good wishes". The same is true for TA *triweñc* in A 378, 4, which is attested in a fragmentary context and can accordingly easily be a subjunctive form as well: //// *ywār tr(i)weñc-<c>i* • (cf. TG, 72, § 389). TA *tsaramäs* from ᴬ*tsär⁽ᵃ⁾*- is not a present form either, but a preterit (see Schmidt, 1974, 50f.; 1975, 291f.). TA *klawa(ṣ)* "verkündet" (as per TG, 436) in A 461 b 3 is no certain active Class IV present either, see the discussion s.v. ᴬ*klāwᵃ*- 'be called; announce'. Finally, it would be quite arbitrary to emend the 3.sg.act. Prs TA *sparcwṣ-äṃ* to an active Prs IV †*sparcwaṣ-äṃ*, and not to take it as a form of a thematic present of Class II (both 3.sg.mid. Prs IV TA *sparcwatär* and 3.sg.act. TA *sparcwṣ-äṃ* can be derived from one single pre-PT present in *-eie̯/o-; see below 26.5.3.).

Accordingly, all active forms listed in TEB can be explained otherwise.

In sum, the evidence suggests that no sprachwirklich active forms of Class III and IV presents existed in either language, so that the medium tantum character of both classes is, in fact, even stricter than formerly assumed. It is, however, quite usual for intransitive verbs of Tocharian to inflect either as a medium tantum or activum tantum, so that in this respect Class III/IV present stems do not present a synchronic irregularity at all.

26.2.3.   *Accent and ablaut pattern in the subjunctive*

In Tocharian B, present Classes III and IV behave differently with respect to their corresponding subjunctive stems. Roots forming a present of Class III usually have a corresponding *ā*-subjunctive with the following characteristics: they have non-initial accent, i.e., follow the basic rule of accentuation. This is true for at least 17 examples. In addition, these subjunctive stems are also almost completely confined to middle inflection, just as in the present stem.[10] Note that

---

[10] Only three possible examples of active *ā*-subjunctives with non-initial accent can be found from Prs III verbs: 1.pl.act. *mäṅkāmo* from *mäṅk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be inferior' attested beside a middle optative; there may be no present stem actually attested beside the 2.sg.act. Opt *wätkoyt* from *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'decide' (if read correctly), but the root should have had a Prs III to judge from its averbo and the attested Prs III in TA. The same may be true for the 3.pl. Sub *pärkaṃ-me* (sic) from *pärkᵃ*- 'arise', for which no present stem is attested in TB, though it is attested in TA, and which also has the kind of paradigm that predicts a Prs

intransitive *ā*-subjunctive stems with non-initial accent associated with other present stem classes can show active inflection as well. On the other hand, an intransitive, all-middle *ā*-subjunctive related to a different present class can also show initial accent. Hence, the mere property of being intransitive and medium tantum in the present stem does not automatically imply suffix accent in the *ā*-subjunctive.[11]

The few exceptions of Class III verbs deviating from the usual pattern are discussed below, and it should be noted that almost all of these roots show at least one other exceptional feature in addition. In contrast to *ā*-subjunctives related to Prs III, the TB *ā*-subjunctive stems correlated with Prs IV without exception have persistent (*)-*ā*- as root vowel and initial accent, and, in addition, are almost exclusively activa tantum.[12] Persistent (*)-*ā*- and initial accent is actually a feature of all roots with full root vowel (*ā*, *au* or *ai*), so the behavior of these subjunctive stems does not deviate from that of other paradigms.

In Tocharian A, roots forming a present of Class III or IV do not deviate with respect to their subjunctive stems from other roots, i.e., have either persistent (*)-*ā*- in the whole subjunctive and preterit stem or show ablaut, but no *ā*-umlaut in the strong stem allomorph. As for voice, just as in Tocharian B the *ā*-subjunctives related to Prs IV are activa tantum. The only example of a medium tantum comes from the

---

III. As will be discussed below in the main text, other active subjunctive forms from Prs III verbs exist, but these show initial accent.

[11] To be sure, there are just two examples of all-middle, intransitive Sub V stems with initial accent: *mäk*[(a)]- 'run' (itr) (m/m/m) (V/V/I), and *mān(t)s*[(a)]-'be sorrowful' (itr) (m/m/m) (II-VI/II-V/I) (NB: root vowel -*ā*-). Most intransitive *ā*-subjunctives with initial accent show active inflection. On the other hand, there are likewise only two intransitive, media tantum Sub V stems of the non-initial class attested outside of a Prs III paradigm: from *mrausk*[(a)]- 'feel disgust, aversion to the world' (itr) (m/m/m) (VI/V/I), and *spänt*[(a)]- 'trust' (itr) (m/m/-) (III/V/I); three such non-initially accented intransitive Sub V stems show both active and middle inflection, which is an uncommon feature, because intransitive stems rarely show voice alternation at all, the only certain examples for such a voice alternation being the roots *pärk*[ä]- '(a)rise', 'become clear' (itr) (-/x/a) (-/V/I) and *räm*[ä]- 'bend, bow' (itr) (a/x/m) (VI/V/I).

[12] There are only two exceptions from exclusive active inflection in the Sub V: *ārt(t)*[(a)]- 'love' (the same is true for [A]*ārt*[ä]-), which behaves irregularly with respect to two other features as well, because it is transitive and inflects as medium tantum in the whole paradigm; the second exception is the once attested 3.sg. middle Opt *spārtoyträ* (MQ, metrical) from *spārtt*[(a)]- 'turn'.

same root as in Tocharian B, i.e., transitive *Aārt^a-* 'love, praise'.[13] The subjunctives to Class III are likewise activa tantum,[14] and hence constitute a contrast to Tocharian B, while the instances of middle forms from this subjunctive class are none too certain.[15]

26.2.4.   *Accent and ablaut pattern in the preterit*

A present of Class III/IV is systematically correlated with preterits of Class I, as is to be expected from roots with A-character.[16] The only two exceptions are *Amäsk^(a)-* 'be' (the TB equivalent has Pt I), and *mit^(a)-*

---

[13] There are not as many examples attested as in Tocharian B: *Aās^(a)-* 'dry (out)', *Aklāw^a-* 'fall', *Aplānt^(a)-* 'rejoice', *Amlusk^a-* 'escape', *Ayāt^(a)-* 'be (cap)able', *Asāk^(a)-* 'remain', *Aspārtw^(a)-* 'turn; behave; be', and perhaps *Awāk^(a)-* 'split apart', for which no TA present is attested, but which should have a Prs IV, to judge from Tocharian B. Whether the contextless *[lm]ārinträ •* in A 205 a 3 contains a 3.sg.mid. Opt TA *ārinträ* from *Aār^(a)-* 'cease' is uncertain, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 38, fn. 1.

[14] There are only six examples attested: *Akul^a-* 'recede', *Atrik^(a)-* 'be confused; faint', *Aritw^(a)-* 'be attached', *Alit^(a)-* 'fall (down, off)', *Awik^(a)-* 'disappear', *Atsälp^(a)-* 'pass away'; perhaps also *Aprutk^(a)-* 'be shut, be filled', for which no present stem is attested in Tocharian A, but the TB equivalent of which has a Prs III. That the same is also true for *Alu^a-* 'send' is not so obvious, because the TA verb may have had a nasal present stem instead of the Prs III attested in TB; see above fn. 7.

[15] *Atsär^(a)-* 'be separated': although the only attested finite form (TA *tsratär*) formally looks like a present of Class III (thus Schmidt, 1974, 49), and the analysis as Sub V would require the assumption of a misspelling for †*tsrātär*, it should nevertheless be analyzed as subjunctive, as in TG, 438, because it is syntactically coordinated with another subjunctive. A further example for a middle subjunctive may come from *Amäṅk^(a)-* 'be inferior', and although no TA present stem is attested, Prs III ought to be expected on account of Tocharian B, and it is further remarkable that only the subjunctive of the TB equivalent *mäṅk^(a)-* likewise behaves exceptionally with respect to voice; but note that it is the other way around in TB, where the Sub V shows irregular active voice beside middle forms. Accordingly, this may be one of the few examples for voice alternation in intransitive stems. Note that middle Sub V TA *wätkāmār* from *Awätk^(a)-* 'separate' is a ghost form, see s.v. *Awätk^(a)-*.

[16] One would expect that in Tocharian A also a middle root preterit (= Pt 0) could act as the correlated preterit stem, but by chance in both possible cases of Pt 0 verbs no respective present stem of the grundverb is attested: *Aluk-* 'light up' (itr) (-/-/m) (-/-/0) beside TB Prs III, and *Awāk^(a)-* 'split apart' (itr) (-/a/x) (-/V/0-I) beside TB Prs IV.

'set out', which have *s*-preterit stems instead (Pt III is also attested for the TA equivalent *Amit²*-, where the preterit is the only stem found from this root). The *s*-preterit of *Amäsk⁽ᵃ⁾*- is most certainly an innovation, whereas the *s*-preterit of *mit⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ *Amit²*- may be old (see s.v. *mit⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'set out').[17] The *ā*-preterit stems correlated with presents of Class III, i.e., those from non-full vowel roots, usually belong to Subclass 2 or 3, i.e., do not show root-initial palatalization. The exceptions are *luᵃ*- 'send' (tr) (m/a/a) (III/V/I) with 3.sg. *lyuwa*,[18] and *luk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'light up, be illuminated' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) with 3.sg. *lyukā-me*; these two roots also show other irregular features (see below 26.2.5.).

Apart from very few exceptions, the *ā*-preterits correlated with present Classes III/IV are activa tantum, which is also true for those present Class III verbs that have an all-middle subjunctive stem in Tocharian B. Exceptional middle inflection in the preterit is attested for only four roots: *ārt(t)⁽ᵃ⁾*-/*Aart⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'love, praise' (medium tantum in the whole paradigm), *nu⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'cry' (only one preterit form is attested, and that is a middle), and *Atsārw⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be comforted, take heart' (only one preterit form is attested, and this is a middle).[19] Note that the first two roots also show other features uncharacteristic of Prs III/IV verbs such as being transitive. For the root *klāyᵃ*- one single middle *ā*-preterit form is attested beside many attestations of active ones, and since this middle form comes from a monastery record, we may be dealing with a secondary, informal-style form. Furthermore, if there is another preterit stem found in addition to the *ā*-preterit in the intransitive grundverb paradigm of Prs III/IV verbs, these are middle like the present: the middle *s*-preterit from *luk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'light up' attested beside an equally intransitive active *ā*-preterit, which is certainly an inner-TB replacement of an intransitive, middle root preterit that is still attested in Tocharian A. Furthermore, there is also an intransitive middle

---

[17] Note that some other seemingly *s*-preterit forms that stand beside Pt I forms such as the 3.pl. *prautkar* from *prutk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be shut' are clearly secondary; see chap. Pt I 7.2.1.1.

[18] The TA equivalent is made from Subclass 4, i.e., shows the same root-initial palatalization in the singular active, but the respective TA present stem, from which no certain forms are attested, may have been a nasal stem in contrast to Tocharian B; see above fn. 7.

[19] As for *yāt⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be (cap)able', what was formerly taken to be a Pt *yatāte* in 109 a 10 can be read as an active 3.sg. *yatā-ne*, as per Schmidt, 1974, 34, fn. 6 and 39f.; the 1.sg.mid. *yatamai* rather belongs to *yät⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'adorn', and the newly attested *yātante* is better analyzed as Pt II; see chap. Pt II 8.1.1., fn. 2.

preterit of Class VII attested beside the (transitive!) active Class I preterit for *krās*[(a)]- 'be angry'.[20]

26.2.5.   *The exceptions from the usual subjunctive/preterit pattern in Tocharian B*

Winter, 1980, 422ff., 430 and 434f. = 2005, 204ff., 212 and 216f. pointed out that the Class III present verbs usually have the characteristics of (1) being intransitive, (2) having an *ā*-preterit without root-initial palatalization, and (3) having in Tocharian B an *ā*-subjunctive with non-initial accent beside them, and that the members of the small group of exceptions to that pattern almost all show more than one deviation from the general scheme. Winter generally explained those deviations as innovations. The exceptions to the middle inflection and non-initial accent rules for the subjunctive are *nu*[(a)]- 'cry' (one active Sub form *nuwaṃ* beside middle forms, initial accent, but no ablaut),[21] *märs*[(a)]- 'forget' (both active and middle Sub forms, initial accent, ablaut), *mit*[(a)]- 'set out' (no finite Sub attested, initial accent in the Inf *mītatsi*, maybe no active inflection), *lu*[ā]- 'send' (only one active Sub V form *lāwä<ṃ>* (sic) attested, which shows ablaut; initial accent highly probable), *luk*[(a)]- 'light up' (only Inf *lukatsi* attested, initial accent, maybe no active inflection), *sruk*[ā]- 'die' (initial accent and ablaut, probably active and middle Sub forms), and *tsänk*[ā]- 'arise' (only active Sub forms, initial accent, ablaut). The present stems of *nu*[(a)]- 'cry' and *luk*[(a)]- 'light up' both show a palatalized root initial (3.sg.mid. *ñewetär*, 3.sg.mid. *lyuketär*), while the present of *tsänk*[ā]- 'arise' is ambiguous with respect to root-initial palatalization (see above 26.1.4.1.). *lu*[ā]- 'send' and *luk*[(a)]- 'light up' further show an *ā*-preterit with palatalized root initial in the active singular. *nu*[(a)]- 'cry' acts strangely, because it is transitive, and the Pt I of this verb has a middle form (actually, this is the only attested form of that stem). *luk*[(a)]- 'light up' and *lu*[ā]- 'send' are the only (certain) Prs III roots to show a preterit stem of Class I with root-initial palatalization (most likely Subclass 1, although no plural

---

[20] This root is exceptional because it shows voice alternation in the grundverb (and Kaus. III as well!) between act. 'vex', mid. 'be angry' with a middle Prs IV, middle Pt VII, but active Pt I. The middle preterit *yātante* is better analyzed as a Pt II kausativum; see chap. Pt II 8.1.1., fn. 2.

[21] Note that this is, in fact, the only Sub V stem with initial accent that has a singular active form without showing ablaut.

forms are attested); on the other hand, *mit*[(a)]- 'set out' shows the peculiarity of having an *s*-preterit instead of an *ā*-preterit; finally, [A]*kulyp*[ä]- 'desire', *märs*[(a)]- 'forget', and *lu*[ä]- 'send' are transitive just like *nu*[(a)]- 'cry' and *ārt(t)*[(a)]-/[A]*ārt*[ä]- 'love, praise'. *nu*[(a)]- 'cry' and *ārt(t)*[(a)]-/[A]*ārt*[ä]- 'love, praise' are in addition among the few examples of a middle preterit stem. To put it the other way round, all TB Prs III forms with palatalized root-initial consonant (*ñewetär*, *lyewetär*, *lyuketär*, and probably also *tseṅketär*) have an unusual subjunctive stem,[22] while for the similar TA presents (TA *śamantär*, TA *śalpatär*, TA *śralune*) this may only hold true for [A]*tsär*[(a)]-; on the other hand, the TA equivalent of *kulype*-, i.e., TA *kulypatär*, is clearly transitive. The same is true for the indisputably transitive TB Prs III stems, since all three of them (i.e., *nu*[(a)]- 'cry', *märs*[(a)]- 'forget', *lu*[ä]- 'send') have irregular subjunctives as well, while from *kulyp*[ä]- 'desire' no subjunctive forms are attested, but root-initial palatalization. Finally, one can also point out that the one Prs III verb with a grundverb *s*-preterit,[23] i.e., *mit*[(a)]-, also behaves peculiarly in the subjunctive stem. The only example of an unusual subjunctive stem in a Prs III paradigm not showing another morphological or morpho-syntactic peculiarity in addition is *sruk*[ä]- 'die'.

Winter, 1980, 438 = 2005, 220 claims "that first-syllable palatalization B-*e*-, A-*a*-followed by B-*e*-, A-*a*- suffix would be a characteristic of verbs of motion without radical suppletion", even though *ñewetär* from *nu*[(a)]- 'cry' does not fit semantically, and I cannot conceive of any diachronic process that might have led to such a result.[24]

---

[22] In the case of [AB]*kulyp*[ä]- no subjunctive stem is attested.

[23] Two other Prs III roots also have an *s*-preterit in the grundverb paradigm, but these cases are different: what seem to be 3.pl. *s*-preterit forms of *prutk*[(a)]- 'be shut' are analogically reshaped *ā*-preterit forms (see the discussion in chap. Pt I 7.2.1.1); the intransitive *s*-preterit forms from *luk*[(a)]- 'light up' are middle and a secondary replacement of the root preterit still attested in Tocharian A.

[24] Winter did not take into account the behavior of present Class IV because he apparently assumes a different source for both stem formations (Winter, 1960, 181f.).

26.2.6.   *Overview of the morphological patterns of Prs III/IV*

Prs III

The exceptions given in brackets are uncertain examples.

Feature	TB	TA	Exceptions
Valency	intransitive		^{A}kulyp^{a}-, nu$^{(a)}$-, märs$^{(a)}$-, lu^{a}-
Prs voice	media tantum		—
Prs root ablaut	non-palatalizing *ä		^{AB}kulyp^{a}-, nu$^{(a)}$-, ^{A}pärsk$^{(a)}$-, ^{A}mlusk^{a}-, lu^{a}-, luk$^{(a)}$-, tsänk^{a}-, ^{A}tsäm$^{(a)}$-, ^{A}tsär$^{(a)}$-, ^{A}tsälp^{a}-, (^{A}tsālt^{a}-)
Sub class	Class V		—
Sub V voice	media tantum	activa tantum	nu$^{(a)}$-, mänk$^{(a)}$-/^{A}mänk$^{(a)}$-, märs$^{(a)}$-, lu^{a}-, tsänk^{a}- (wätk$^{(a)}$-, pärk^{a}-, sruk^{a}-, ^{A}tsär$^{(a)}$-)
Sub V accent	basic-rule	—	nu$^{(a)}$-, märs$^{(a)}$-, mit$^{(a)}$-, luk$^{(a)}$-, sruk^{a}-, tsänk^{a}-
Pt class	Class I		^{A}mäsk$^{(a)}$-, mit$^{(a)}$-
Pt I voice	activa tantum		nu$^{(a)}$-
Pt I subgroup	no root-initial palatalization		lu^{a}-, luk$^{(a)}$-

Prs IV

Feature	TB	TA	Exceptions
Valency	intransitive		ārt(t)$^{(a)}$-/^{A}ārt^{a}-
Prs voice	media tantum		—
Sub V voice	activa tantum		ārt(t)$^{(a)}$-/^{A}ārt^{a}-, spārtt$^{(a)}$-
Sub V accent	initial	—	—
Pt I voice	activa tantum		ārt(t)$^{(a)}$-/^{A}art$^{(a)}$-, klāy^{a}-, ^{A}tsārw$^{(a)}$-

26.3.   THE TYPE *koloktär*

The following four roots have a special root structure, because they are the only disyllabic, or one prefers, trisyllabic roots in Tocharian. Synchronically, their present stem formation seems to be that of athematic Class I, but there is reason to believe that they formerly formed a present of Class IV:

kālāk^{a}- 'follow' (tr) (m/-/a) (I/-/I), *pārāk$^{(a)}$-* 'prosper' (itr) (a/-/-) (I/V/-), *wālāk^{a}-* 'stay, abide' (itr) (m/-/-) (I/-/-), *sānāp^{a}-* 'anoint' (tr) (m/-/-) (I/V/-).

	Prs	Imp		Imp
1.sg.mid.	*wolokmar*	—	1.sg.act.	—
2.sg.mid.	—	—	2.sg.act.	—
3.sg.mid.	*koloktär*,	*sonopitär*,	3.sg.act.	—
	woloktär, sonoptär	*wolośitär*		
1.pl.mid.	—	—	1.pl.act.	—
2.pl.mid.	—	—	2.pl.act.	*porośicer*
3.pl.mid.	*kolok(e)ntär*,	—	3.pl.act.	*porośyeṃ*
	wolokentär			

> *nt*-Part   —   *m*-Part *kolokmane* Ger/Abs *sonopälle*

From a synchronic point of view, the inflection is clearly athematic. The 3.pl. *wolokentär* with thematic 3.pl. ending -*entär* can safely be explained as analogical, because such an intrusion of thematic endings into athematic paradigms is not uncommon especially in the 3. plural, see TEB I, 197, § 351,1,[25] and chap. Prs I 24.1.2. As for the 3.pl. *kolo[ka]nträ* in the MQ text 255 a 2f., in the case of a genuine athematic form one would expect †*kolokänträ*, because in MQ texts unaccented /ä/ should not be rendered by ⟨a⟩. Since the akṣara in question is almost unreadable, I propose that we may have here again -*entär*, i.e., *kolo[k](e)nträ*.[26]

Judging from the averbo, from the middle voice in the present, and from the intransitive valency of at least three of the four, Warren Cowgill (apud Ringe, 1987, 104f.) and, independently, Adams, 1988, 403 proposed that we are here dealing with present stems that originally belonged to Class IV, e.g., 3.sg.mid. **kolokotär*, which finally lost the third *o*.[27] Both Cowgill and Adams also assumed that *kālāk^a*- 'follow' is cognate with the TA root *^Akälk^a*- 'go' and for the type of the former set up a pre-PT *o*-grade allomorphs from seṭ roots with enlargement by an obstruent of the shape *CoRH-K-. Peters, 2004, 441 objected to that claim that the laryngeal should have been lost in such a context, and speculated that we are rather dealing with a sequence of the structure pre-PT *CäRaC- that had developed by sound law out of a sequence PIE *CŕHC-, i.e., a zero-grade sequence

---

[25] But note that instead of "**wolokantär*" one should expect *wolokäntär*.

[26] The *e*-vowel may also have simply been omitted due to an error, because this manuscript contains many inaccurate spellings and omissions of signs.

[27] Winter, 1994, 403 = 2005, 452 assumes that this *o*-drop is part of a more general rule, according to which in PT sequences of three identical full vowels (with the exception of TB *CāCaCä*) the third is reduced to *ä which is then lost in an open syllable.

*CR̥HC- that had secondarily attracted the accent either already in PIE or in Very Early pre-PT, but Peters was not able to tell in which morphological category such a sequence could have occurred. Therefore, I think it is better to assume that *CäRC- was the lautgesetzlich outcome of any PIE *CR̥HC- sequence in Tocharian, and that *CäRaC- was simply a newly created analogical zero-grade type, which was based on full grades of the *CeRaC- type, or lengthened grades of the *CēRaC- type as attested by Pt I (of Subclass 7) *śalāka*.

It has to be pointed out that this small group of verbs deviates in some respects from the usual characteristics of Class IV verbs: the imperfect suffix -*i*- apparently palatalizes the palatalizable root finals of *pārāk*[(a)]- and *wālāk*[a]-, whereas all examples of imperfects from what are synchronically Prs IV stems (and also those from Prs III stems with one exception) do not have a palatalizing imperfect suffix; furthermore, the imperfects *porośicer* and *porośyeṃ* of *pārāk*[(a)]- are active forms, which would make them the only active forms from any present stem of Class IV; finally, the Class I preterit of *kālāk*[a]- has root-initial palatalization and belongs synchronically to Subclass 7 (the evident TA equivalent [A]*kälk*[a]- has a Subclass 3, i.e., non-palatalized Pt I). No finite subjunctive forms are attested from any of these four roots, but we have the non-finite Sub V forms *parākalñe*, *parākatsi*, and *sanāpalle*, *sanāpatsi*, which all bear the accent on the second syllable, whereas the Sub V associated with what are synchronically Prs IV all have root-initial accent. Clearly, the only thing all these facts suggest is that these four verbs were detached from the synchronic pattern of Prs IV verbs, but this does not necessarily imply that all or any of these divergences from the standard behavior of Prs IV verbs are something old; this may be especially true for the palatalizing effect of the imperfect suffix, because I would rather explain the non-palatalizing imperfect of the TB Prs III/IV stems as archaism (see below 26.5.3.).

26.4.   SEMANTICS AND FUNCTION

With the exception of the few transitive ones, Class III and IV presents as a rule "denote a state, or more commonly the process of entering a state", as per Jasanoff, 1975, 102; "while most denote an action or process, a substantial minority are stative", as per Jasanoff, 1978, 27. According to Schmidt, 1974, 99ff., all intransitive middles from the semantic field of "sein, werden, vergehen" either constitute the Class

III/IV present part of paradigms that he calls "Medioaktiva"[28] or belong to media tantum paradigms, except *miw*[(a)]- 'shake' which has active and middle forms in a different distribution. Schmidt, 1974 was, of course, only concerned with middle forms, but if we have a look at the behavior of intransitive verbs with respect to voice in Tocharian in general, we get the following picture:

Intransitive verbal paradigms are usually either activa tantum or media tantum with very few exceptions, and these exceptions overwhelmingly do not denote a state but are rather verbs of motion, such as *miw*[(a)]- 'shake'.

26.4.1. *Triple roots*

Roots that have a triple set of paradigms consisting of grundverb, antigrundverb, and Kausativum II regularly have a present of either Class III or IV in the intransitive grundverb paradigm, and accordingly also have the characteristics discussed above in the subjunctive/preterit stem. While there are no triple roots not having a Class I preterit (or, alternatively, a Class 0 Pt in TA) and a Class V subjunctive in the grundverb paradigms, present classes other than Class III/IV are indeed occasionally attested in the grundverb paradigm of triple roots (namely Prs I, V, VI, and also VIII but finite Prs VIII forms only in the middle). This means that for many intransitive grundverb paradigms with a Prs III/IV, a transitive counterpart consisting of an *s*-present, a Class I or II subjunctive, and an *s*-preterit may be assumed, as in the case of:

wāk[(a)]-/ [A]*wāk*[(a)]- grundverb TB 'split apart, bloom' (itr)/ TA 'split part, break apart, burst' (itr) with Prs IV (m) (not attested in TA), Sub V (a)/ TA Sub V (a), Pt I (-)/ TA Pt 0 (m), Pt I (a); antigrundverb TB mid. 'differ' (itr)/ TA act. 'take apart', mid. 'differ' (tr/itr) with Prs VIII (m)/ TA Prs VIII (m), TA Sub VII (a), TA Pt III (a); Kausativum II TB 'let bloom' (tr) with Sub IXb (-), and Pt IV (a).

26.4.2. *The voice/valency pattern of Prs III/IV verbs*

In general, voice and valency in Tocharian is correlated in the following way:

---

[28] Schmidt, 1974, 34f. with fn. 2 opts for the Class III suffix *-e-* as a suffix denoting intransitive valency just like that of subjunctive Class III, but then what about the rest of the paradigm?

Transitive verbs can be activa tantum, media tantum, or show voice alternation, the middle voice can in the latter case denote various different middle semantics as inherited from PIE such as reflexive function, see chap. Voice in detail.

In contrast, intransitive verbs are usually either activa tantum or media tantum in the entire paradigm.

A small group of unaccusative verbs of the *break* type can express causative alternation by simple voice alternation in the present and preterit stems, as is the case with *päk-* active 'cook (tr), let ripen', mid. 'cook (itr), ripen', see chap. Valency 4.5.1.

The truly remarkable characteristic of paradigms with a present of Class III/IV is therefore not that they consist of all-middle present stems and all-middle/all-active subjunctive/preterit stems respectively, but the very combination of both media tantum present (and subjunctive) stems and activa tantum preterit (and subjunctive) stems in one single intransitive paradigm. Hence, any theory on present Classes III/IV must explain why the speakers of Tocharian chose the middle inflection for the present stem Classes III and IV, but had active inflection for the preterit of the same paradigm in both languages, and middle inflection for the subjunctive stems to present Class III in Tocharian B, and, in contrast, active inflection in Tocharian A, and, again, active inflection for the subjunctives to present Class IV in both languages.

The exclusive use of middle voice in Prs III/IV hence seems to be linked to their specific morphology. This assumption seems further supported by the fact that a similar situation can be observed in the case of the Class III subjunctive. Class III subjunctives are (almost) exclusively confined to the function of acting as intransitive subjunctive stems in the case of causative alternation verbs of the *päk-* 'cook' type. Note that this parallelism does not necessarily suggest that both classes have to reflect one and the same inherited pattern or preform; what it does suggest is simply that the middle inflection of present Classes III and IV and likewise subjunctive Class III must have to do with morphology rather than with valency or semantics.

26.5.   DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

Present Classes III and IV are parallel formations inasmuch as they form part of the same kind of paradigms, and share a lot of morphological characteristics.

That both classes stand in complementary distribution, as is often asserted in literature, is, however, not so obvious; as was argued above, a Prs III goes usually together with a Pt I of Subclass 2/3, and a Prs IV usually stands beside a Pt I of Subclass 5, but at least the core members of Subclass 2/3 and Subclass 5 were of completely different origins. On the other hand, I also argued that very few members of Subclass 5, such as TB *wāka, TA wāk, are indeed to be taken for primary formations in pre-PT *-ā- much in the same way as all the core members of Subclass 2/3. There exists also a complementary distribution with respect to the outcomes of a root vowel PT *(')æ in Tocharian B: whenever no Pt I with respective root vowel *'æ or *æ (> TB -ā- by ā-umlaut) is attested, PT *(')æ surfaces as TB -e-, and the present accordingly belongs to Class III; otherwise, the root vowel surfaces as TB -o-, and the present is therefore of Class IV. Because of these two arguments, one would indeed very much like to derive the stem-final vowels of both Prs III and Prs IV from one common PT source, which, however, may have had different ancestors at the pre-PT stage.

So far, no agreement has been reached with respect to the origin of these stem-final vowels. There are basically two different approaches: a simple vowel as origin of the stem-final vowel(s), or the result(s) of vowel contraction. As for the theories assuming contraction, it has so far been proposed to derive the vowels from "stative" *-eh$_1$-(i̯e/o-) or *-h$_1$-i̯e/o-, denominative *-eh$_2$-i̯e/o-, or deinstrumental *-oh$_1$-i̯e/o-.

26.5.1.   *The problem of the phonological correlation of the Class III and IV suffixes*

Although present Classes III and IV seem to be morphologically parallel formations, they possibly differ not only with respect to the root ablaut, but also with respect to the suffix; at least this will be the first impression. Whereas the non-palatalizing suffix of present Class III -e-/ TA -a- can easily be derived from PT *-æ-, the stem-final phoneme equivalent TB -o-/ TA -a- of present Class IV seems at a first glance to result from familiar PT *-å-. However, the suffix vowel of Class IV seems also to have triggered a change of a non-diphthongal root vowel -ā- into surface -o-/ TA -a-.[29]

---

[29] As for the diphthongs with vowel (*)-ā-, they do not seem to have been affected by that change, since in TB, it would have been possible to write an *ow*-diphthong at least in older texts, and an *-oy-* in any kind of texts, but even

There are basically three different strategies to be considered in order to account for the suffix vowel of Class IV: (1) deriving it from the familiar PT *å phoneme that resulted from pre-PT *ā, *-as, and *-ōs; (2) deriving it from another familiar PT vowel, which, of course, should have been capable of triggering the umlaut attested just in the limited context of present Class IV and the noun *onolme* (see TEB I, 200, § 359; Jasanoff, 1978, 29ff.; VW II/2, 53ff., § 63; Adams, 1988a, 21, 70ff.; Pinault, 1989, 137f.); (3) setting up a special phoneme only for this context (Ringe, 1987, 98ff.; 1991, 84ff.; 1996, 119ff., followed by the Freiburg school and Peters; see below).

Strategy (1)[30] immediately turns out not to be viable, because in Class IV presents, the root vowel can almost never be derived from a pre-PT *ā-vowel, and PT *å from pre-PT *ā, *-as, and *-ōs just caused a preceding PT *æ to develop into both *o* and TA *o*, and not a preceding PT *ā-vowel to turn into *o* and TA *a*;[31] hence, we are left with strategies (2) and (3), i.e., we are facing the methodological problem that a phonological process occurs in what seems a limited morphological context.

---

in MQ texts only the diphthongs *ai* and *au* are attested (to be sure, there is no attestation to be found in a paleographically archaic text). Accordingly, the stem-final vowel must have been backed rather than rounded by the preceding root vowel.

[30] As first advanced by Pedersen, 1941, 221. A simple PIE *-ā- > PT *-å- turning a preceding PT *-æ- into -*o*- was later also assumed by Normier, 1980, 252, 255; Hilmarsson, 1986, 204, fn. 13 (partly followed by Rasmussen, 1988, 168f.) and 1989a, 128, fn. 13 (he does not comment on Class III). Similarly, Isebaert, 2002, 96 for *klowo*-/TA *klawa-*.

[31] As for the first claim, see the massive evidence gathered by Hilmarsson himself (1986, 29-38; TA *sasyu* clearly has an analogical -*a*- as reduplication vowel), and also Normier, 1980, 252, 255; as for the second claim, cf. forms such as *kāko*, *kāwo*, *pānto*, *māskwo*, *tsārwo*. Normier's additional assumption (1980, 252) that PT *ā was turned into -*o*-/ TA -*a*- by a following PT *-å- only if the latter was "nicht auslautend" is completely arbitrary and contradicted by plural forms such as *kakonta*. Note that all of the well-established umlaut phenomena of Tocharian, the *ā*-umlaut, the *u*-umlaut, and the *æ ... å > *o ... å umlaut, *did* occur in disyllabic forms as well. Note that Kümmel despite his most improbable claim that the root vowels of all Class IV presents have always been pre-PT *ā > PT *å, nevertheless does not follow Strategy (1), but clings to Strategy (3), operating with a stem-final vowel "*e$_2$" said to be "differentiated from normal *e and *æ" (2009, 177f.).

26.5.1.1.   *The nominal suffixes -elme and -olme*

Outside of present Classes III and IV, the correlation of root vowel (*)*ä* with suffix vowel *-e-*/ TA *-a-* on the one hand and of root vowel *o* from PT *ā* with suffix vowel *-o-* on the other seems to reoccur in the case of the nominal suffixes *-elme*/ TA *-aläm* and *-olme*, but the evidence seems to consist altogether of four forms only. The suffix *-elme* is found with the following forms:

(1) *yśelme*/ TA *yśaläm** (only attested in the plural forms *yśalmañ*, *yśalmas*) '[sexual] pleasure'. The noun can be connected with *ykāssäññe* 'sexual pleasure, concupiscence', cf. Adams, DoT, 521. Hence, we have to do with a root †*yäk*^{ä}- '± having pleasure' not attested in any verb form. Note that the suffix *-elme* apparently palatalizes and thereby suggests a pre-PT shape *-ēlmo-.

(2) *wpelme* 'cobweb' can safely be connected with *wepe* '± paddock' and *yepe* 'spider' from the PIE aniṭ root *√h$_{2/3}$ueb^h 'weave'; as for Tocharian forms from this root, only the subjunctive/preterit stem variant *wāpā-* is attested with certainty in both Tocharian A and B. Since *wpelme* 'cobweb' has an unpalatalized initial, it must go back to a form with a zero-grade *h$_{2/3}$ub^h- (cf. Klingenschmitt, 1992, 126 = 2005, 342, fn. 63: *ub^h-ol-mo-).

(3) *syelme* 'sweat' certainly belongs to *siy*^{ä}- 'sweat', and further to a PIE aniṭ root *√sueid of the same meaning.

Whereas *wpelme* can directly continue a pre-PT *ub^{h}ē/olmo-, a pre-PT *suidē/olmo- should, in my view, have resulted in TB *salme* (cf., e.g., ^{AB}*wä(s)$^?$-* 'give' if from PT *wādā-; see s.v. *wä(s)$^?$-* 'give'). Therefore, it is best to derive *syelme* from the Sub V stem, i.e., from a proto-form PT *säyā-ælmæ (see Ringe, 1987, 117; 1996, 58f., fn. 2), and not directly from the *suid-ol-mo- set up by Jasanoff, 1978, 32 and Klingenschmitt, 1992, 126 = 2005, 342, fn. 63.

The suffix *-olme* is only found with *onolme* 'being'. This word is usually taken to be an uncompounded derivative with suffixal *-(V)lme* from the A-character root **ān*^{ä}- < PIE seṭ root *√h$_2$enh$_1$ 'breathe' also attested by the *sk*-extended root *ān*$^{(ä)}$*-sk-* 'breathe in', an etymology first proposed by Meillet, apud Hoernle, 1916, 391, and mostly accepted,[32] with the notable exceptions of Hilmarsson, 1986,

---

[32] Couvreur, 1947a, 10, fn. 11 and 1949, 33f. compares TA *wrasom* 'being', which he derives from ^{A}*wärs-* 'breathe', cf. the noun TA *wraseṃ* 'breath'. A parallel for the semantic development (apart from Skt. *prāṇin-* 'vivant; être vivant' cited by VW I, 336) is also found in Old Turkish *tınlıg* 'being' ← *tın* 'breath?'; apart from Couvreur, see Adams, DoT, 115 and Georg, 2001, 493.

199 and Rasmussen, 1988, 170f., and 2002, 376 with fn. 5 who took the word for a compound.[33] Although it would make sense morphologically to derive *onolme* directly from PIE *h_2anh_1-olmo- > pre-PT *anolmo-, as per Jasanoff, 1978, 32; 2003, 157, fn. 24, and Widmer, 1998, 172, with regard to both *yśelme* and *syelme* a proto-form PT *ānāælmæ is to be preferred, as per Ringe, 1996, 36, 58f., fn. 2; see also Pinault, 2009, 480: "*ānā-ælmæ est donc la forme sous-jacente, en termes structurels".

In sum, the evidence from the nouns in *-elme* and *-olme* is not conclusive, but nevertheless seems rather to favor the view that the stem-final vowels of the two present classes go back to one single PT sequence of two vowels, viz. *-āæ-.

26.5.1.2.   *The umlaut theories for Class IV*

The next question to be addressed is the special kind of (double) umlaut that is evidently met not only in Class IV presents, but also in the noun *onolme* discussed above in 26.5.1.1.[34]

Couvreur, 1947a, 10, § 6 proposed -o-o-/TA -a-a- in present Class IV to be derived from PT *-ā-ā-, and did not believe in a common source for present Classes III and IV; but pace Couvreur (and now also Kümmel, 2009) a root vowel pre-PT *ā is mostly excluded on account of the shape of the roots involved.

According to TEB I, 54, § 25,2, "scheint ursprüngliches -a- in Mittelsilbe nach *a, ai, au* der ersten Silbe zu -o- gerundet worden zu sein, wobei das *a* der ersten Silbe dann durch Labialumlaut selbst zu *o* wurde", i.e., they assume a kind of mutual rounding, and state on p. 55, § 26,4 that the aforementioned "ursprüngliches -a-" "wohl sicher" goes back to a "kurzen Vokal (*a, o*?) des Idg.". Similarly, Adams,

---

[33] It is not unreasonable to think that *oṅkolmo*/ TA *oṅkaläm* 'elephant' contains a similar suffix (thus at first Van Windekens, 1941, 82: *ank-alm-o from *ank- = *eṅk-* 'seize'); see now Pinault, 2008, 435f. and 2009, 484, who proposes a calque *āṅk-ålmæ "animal-main" based on Skt. *hastin-*.

[34] Totally ad hoc is the analogical explanation by Van Windekens (VW I, 19 and VW II/2, 58) which has *o* having spread from the gerundive, where PIE *o should have remained labial before the *ly*; see the objections by, e.g., Rasmussen, 1988, 179 and Ringe, 1991, 86, fn. 73. Similarly ad hoc is the suggestion by Kortlandt apud Lubotsky, 1985, 7 to derive present Class IV from a present stem formation in *-u̯æ- created by adding the Class III suffix to participles in *-u, and having *å < *æ via labial umlaut. Apart from the fact that a sequence PT *u̯æ otherwise develops into TB *we*, this is a strange morphological assumption.

1978a, 448 proposed "mutual rounding" of pre-PT *a ... ó into TB *o* ... *o*. He explicitly stated that the rounding only took place when the "PTch *ế" [i.e., PT *æ, M.M.] bore the accent as in "*ānếlme" > *onolme*, so that in a case like PIE *bhagos > *pāke* no umlaut would be expected. According to Adams, a stressed PT *æ turned into "ǫ" could also have been restored by analogy, hence *procer*, not †*procor*, from "*prācếr".

Normier, 1980, 252, 255 claimed there is a special kind of PT "*o*-umlaut" triggering "urt. *ā > *o* vor nicht auslautendem *o* der Folgesilbe" and evidenced by *osotär* < "frühurt. *āsotär*"; in his notation, PT *"o" is the result of pre-PT *ā, i.e., the equivalent of my PT *å; accordingly, he follows Pedersen, 1941, 221, and evidently has to derive *onolme* from a quite unexpected pre-PT *anālmo- > PT *ānålmæ (now also advocated by Pinault, 2009, 481ff.). See my general objections above in fn. 31.

Winter apud Adams, 1988a, 21 proposed "progressive assimilation of a PTch *e to the preceding *o*, e.g., [pre-PT, M.M.] *āsotor > *osetär > *osotär", a view he has, however, now given up (W. Winter, p.c.). Adams himself did likewise not follow this suggestion, because he does not believe in the sound law pre-PT *ā > PT *å, and also correctly fails to see why such a process should be triggered by both pre-PT *ā and *ă (which he thinks is required, e.g., for *onolme*). Adams therefore rather maintains his explanation of 1978a, but now states that a mutual rounding PT *CāCæ- > *CåCå- affected the outcomes of both PIE *ā and *ă, but not the one of *H (because of *pācer* etc.).

According to Jasanoff, 1975, 106f.; 1978, 30ff.; 1992, 144 and 151, fn. 29; Jasanoff, 2003, 157, fn. 24; followed, e.g., by Villanueva Svensson, 2003, 294, and a similar suggestion by Pinault, 1989, 137, the umlaut to be seen in this present class can be compared to the *u*-umlaut. By *u*-umlaut — as first described by Pedersen, 1941, 220f. — pre-PT *o turns out as TB/TA *o* (instead of *e*, TA *a*) if the following syllable contained a pre-PT *u. Jasanoff, 1978, 30ff. states that in phonological terms we are dealing with a preservation of the labial component of pre-PT *o if followed by a likewise labial *u, hence: *CoCu → CoCä. He claims pre-PT *o was delabialized to PT *æ in (almost) all of the other contexts. In a similar fashion, Jasanoff thinks a pre-PT sequence *a ... o first turned into *o* ... *o* by assimilation, while *o was kept labial: "the mutual influence of the two *o*-vowels in *osotär*, *plontotär*, etc. was sufficient to prevent the passage of the sequence *o ... o to *ă ... ă in Common Tocharian, and [...] the loss of rounding seen in A *asatär*, *plantatär* reflects a development specific to Toch. A" (Jasanoff, 1975, 107).

Objections against Jasanoff's assumption of such an umlaut of pre-PT *a ... o > o ... o, TA *a ... a* have been raised by Ringe, 1987, 115ff.; 1991, 86; 1996, 119ff., who pointed out that a similar umlaut did not occur in cases such as:[35] PIE *bʰágos > *pákæ > *pāke*/ TA *pāk* 'part', PIE *h₂éḱos > *ákæ > *āke*/ TA *āk* 'end', PIE *su̯adrós > *swārǽ > *swāre*/ TA *swār* 'sweet', PIE *ph₂tér > *pācǽr > *pācer*/ TA *pācar* 'father', and PIE *dʰugh₂tér > *täkācǽr > *tkācer*/ TA *ckācar* 'daughter'.[36]

Rasmussen, 1988, 172, 179f., and then also in 2002, 375 objected to Ringe's argument, suggesting that the umlaut did not operate only if the *æ-vowel stood in a final syllable.

Widmer, 1998, 171f. and Jasanoff, most recently 2004, 141 also defend the umlaut rule by stating that the absence of rounding in forms like the *s*-stem *āke* 'end' or thematic *āntse* 'shoulder' can be due to analogical influence from the prevailing group of *o*- and *s*-stems not containing PT *-ā- in the root. Of course, one could also argue that the kind of umlaut involved need not have been an exceptionless sound law at all, see my remarks on *ā*-umlaut in Tocharian A in chap. Sound Laws 1.5.

Finally, Burlak/Itkin, 2003, 30 have a very different view on the outcome of *o: "PT non-final *o* remained unchanged in TA in the initial syllable and yielded *a* in later syllables", present Class IV just being an exception, which they explain (p. 31f.) via an assimilation of the root vowel TA *a* to the suffix vowel, which they in turn derive from the thematic vowel *o or, calling this "more plausible", by analogical introduction of the suffix vowel TA *-a-* from present Class III.

In sum, one can say that it is not impossible, and not even very improbable that PT *ā ... æ could turn into TB *o ... o* / TA *a ... (*)a*, but as rightly admitted by an advocate of the umlaut rule such as Rasmussen, 1988, 171, there does not exist any independent corroborative evidence militating in favor of such an umlaut; in my view, *onolme* certainly provides no such evidence.

---

[35] In what follows, I render the PT vowels concerned in my own notation, which is quite different from Ringe's; and note in addition that Ringe thinks that pre-PT *ē and *o did *not* turn into one and the same PT vowel.

[36] To these forms, one could now also add TA *klāwa-* 'declare, recite', if this stem is to be derived from pre-PT *klōu̯ei̯e- > PT *klāw'æ-; see s.v. *klāwā⁽ᵃ⁾-*.

26.5.1.3.   *Setting up a special phoneme*

Since Strategy (2) does not work so exceedingly well, it is quite understandable that some scholars tried out Strategy (3). Of course, this special phoneme otherwise alien to PT could only have been the result of a vowel contraction, and since no palatalization occurred, the first vowel in the sequence would have to be an *a*- or/and *o*-vowel; furthermore, since we are dealing with present formations, the whole complex would have to be pre-PT *-ăi̯e/o- or/and *-ŏi̯e/o-, and actually there exists independent evidence militating in favor of a quite early lautgesetzlich loss of intervocalic PIE = pre-PT *-i̯- in Tocharian, see, e.g., Katz, 1997, 69. If one sets up pre-PT *-ăi̯e/o- or/and *-ōi̯e/o-, this would also be perfectly in line with the fact that the respective preterits and subjunctives regularly end in PT *-ā-. Even better, as argued above, the nouns in *-elme* and *-olme* seem to provide independent evidence in favor of PT *ä ... āæ > TB *ä* ... *e* and PT *ā ... āæ > TB *o* ... *o*.

The first to come up with such a solution was Warren Cowgill, but his suggestion was published only posthumously, by Don Ringe as late as 1987 (Ringe, 1987, 117ff.; in more detail in Ringe, 1991, 87ff.; 1996, 56ff., 119ff.). Unfortunately, Ringe linked this analysis, which looks quite plausible from an inner-Tocharian point of view, to another, comparative analysis of the respective disyllabic sequence(s) as resulting from PIE *-h₁-i̯e/o- (see immediately below).[37] As far as I can see, Ringe has been followed only by the members of the Freiburg school (who also adopted his claim about provenance from PIE *-h₁-i̯e/o-) on the one hand, and Peters (1997, 1999, 2006) on the other hand.

---

[37] It is not so clear to me what Ringe currently thinks about Cowgill's analysis. In Ringe, 2000, 137 fn. 39 we find the following statement about the Class III and IV presents: "Functionally they appear to be connected with the statives in *-éh₁- (Jasanoff 1978: 28), but the formal equation remains very difficult; I am no longer convinced that Ringe 1996: 56-9 is even approximately the correct solution to this puzzle." To judge from Ringe, 2006, 132ff., 179ff., it is not the PIE *-h₁-i̯e/o- part of Cowgill's explanation he is no longer convinced of.

26.5.2.   *Theories on the PIE origin of Classes III and IV*

26.5.2.1.   *Generalization of *-o-*

Couvreur, 1947a, 60f., § 100,b and 101 with § 6, p. 10 was the first to propose that the Class III suffix goes back to a generalization of the PIE thematic stem-final vowel *-o-. Note that Couvreur separated present Classes III and IV,[38] without coming up with a convincing solution for the preform of Class IV. TEB I, 54, § 25,2, and VW II/1, 53f., § 63 basically adopted this solution, but in addition applied it also to Class IV, claiming that the labial character of the suffix in Class IV was due to the *ā*-vocalism in the preceding root syllable, but without further phonological discussion. Such a generalization of the *o*-allomorph of the thematic suffix is otherwise said to have occurred in the Baltic thematic presents, the Gothic passive, various thematic stem formations of Hittite (as per Jasanoff, 1978, 49f.), and according to Rix, 1993, 337, also in the South Picene *o*-perfect.[39]

Generalization of a PIE *-o-morpheme common to both present classes has also always played a central role in the various theories by Jasanoff. In 1975, 110ff. Jasanoff evidently thought that the media tantum of Classes III and IV exclusively go back to thematic iterative and inchoative presents in *-sḱé/ó- on the one hand and athematic middle root aorists on the other hand, which according to him had in common the use of 3.sg. forms ending in *-ó(r), the *-o- of which eventually would have become generalized throughout the whole

---

[38] And note also that Couvreur, hereby following TG, 352f., § 437 and § 438, labels Prs III as Class "II", and Prs IV as Class "III".

[39] For the latter see now also Beckwith, 2007, 77ff. According to Oettinger's and Klingenschmitt's views, the thematic middle had *-o- as thematic vowel throughout the whole paradigm even right from the start, i.e., already in PIE times; see Oettinger, 1985, esp. 311f. (where he claims that this kind of reconstruction is suggested and recommended by Hittite forms of the *šarratta* type — which, however, can be explained as based on blends of athematic middle forms ending in *-a* with such ending in *-ta* — and explicitly equates the Hittite *šarratta* type with the TB *mäsketär* and the Gothic *nimada* types); see also Oettinger, 1992, 237; 1993, 350, 352, and passim on the one hand and Klingenschmitt, 1994b, 226f. = 2005, 441f. (followed by Matzinger, 2006, 126) on the other hand. (Klingenschmitt does not refer to Oettinger's papers at all, and makes his claim only on account of both Sanskrit media tantum thematic present stems such as *loka-* lacking root-final palatalization, which, however, may go back to more archaic athematic present stems as well, and alleged Albanian evidence, for which, however, see now Schumacher, 2007, 265, fn. 60.)

paradigm (cf. also Jasanoff, 1978, 37ff.; 47ff.). From 1978 on he also includes as sources (athematic) acrostatic presents with root vowels PIE *-ē- and *-o- (see Jasanoff, 1978, 44f.; 1992, 151, fn. 24). Since 2003, 50 and passim, however, he evidently prefers to derive the *lipetär* type of Class III presents, and also Class IV present *wokotär* from PIE athematic zero-grade root presents rather than from PIE zero-grade middle root aorists with a 3.sg. ending in *-o(r), suggesting "the forms in question may be referred to as 'root stative-intransitive presents', or simply 'root stative-intransitives'" (Jasanoff, 2003, 158); cf. also Jasanoff, 2004, 158. As becomes evident from Jasanoff, 1998, 304, fn. 19; 2003, 50f.; 2004, 158, he now also thinks that there did not exist thematic middles with non-alternating or "persistent" *-o- already in PIE: "what Germanic and Tocharian inherited from PIE was a common tendency for thematic middle paradigms to generalize *-o- as the thematic vowel when the 3. sg. ended in *-or/*-oi rather than *-etor/*-etoi".

Similarly, Adams, 1978, 280 and, more explicitly, 1988a, 70ff. claimed that the core of the classes was based on 3.sg. middle forms in *-o, which he said belonged to *thematic* paradigms (referring to Watkins, 1969, 50f. and 77), but he also assumed that some Prs IV were denominatives; see below 26.5.2.3.

Rasmussen, 1988, 168ff. basically embraced Jasanoff's explanation of 1978, but nevertheless suggested a mixed origin: "If the stem vowel *-æ- is not only from IE *-o-, as Jasanoff claims [...], but also occasionally represents earlier *-ē- of the stative verbs (and perhaps *-ei̯e- of causatives) with lack of palatalization by analogy with the main types (generalized *-o- in thematic media tantum and *-ā- of the *trop-ā- iterative type)".

Widmer, 1998, 176ff. also basically followed Jasanoff, and evidently opted for an athematic character of the middle ending *-o that he assumed to have been generalized, at least for the special case he was concerned with.

26.5.2.2.   *"Stative" theory*

26.5.2.2.1.   Simple PIE *-eh₁-
Watkins, 1962, 70f., and, independently, Schmid, 1963, 99f. were the first to propose a connection with *ē*-"stative" verbs, i.e., a derivation from a suffix pre-PT *-ē-, i.e., PIE *-eh₁- (given up by Watkins himself in 1973, 51, fn. 1, but revived by Rasmussen, 1988, 169f. and Kim, 2007, 197; 2009, 18ff.). An obvious drawback of this analysis is, of course, the lack of palatalization, cf. Ringe, 1991, 84 with fn. 68; note that there *did*

exist some surface forms with palatalized consonant in front of a PT
*-æ-.

26.5.2.2.2.   PIE *-eh₁-i̯e/o-

Rasmussen, 2002, 376 modifies his view of 1988 on the Class III and IV
presents only insofar as he would now prefer to derive those he
formerly thought to be "stative" presents in *-eh₁- not from proto-
forms in bare *-eh₁- ("since that would be the stem of the old aorist"),
but in *-eh₁-i̯e(/o)-, further claiming that in that case we would have to
do with a "generalization of the denominative stative sequence *-eh₁-
i̯e/o-" that according to him is also to be seen in Latin ("*valeō* like
albeō") and Germanic.

26.5.2.2.3.   PIE *-h₁-i̯e/o-

Basing himself on an assumption by Warren Cowgill, Ringe, first 1987,
117ff., and in more detail 1991, 87ff.; 1996, 56ff., 119ff. derived present
Classes III/IV from a PIE "stative" present formation in *-h₁-i̯é/ó-[40]
which was also said to underlie the Germanic weak Class III presents
in *-ai-/*-(j)a- and, as per Cowgill, 1963, 264ff. = 2006, 489ff. the Balto-
Slavic deverbative present formations in *-ī-, respectively *-ĭ-. This
derivation of Class III/IV from *-h₁-i̯é/ó- was adopted by Harðarson,
1998, 332; Hackstein, 1998, 230; 2002a, 268, fn. 12,[41] and quite generally
by ²LIV (where this kind of present formation is called by the
Harðarson-based term "Essiv"[42]).[43]

As a matter of fact, to derive all these presents from a *-h₁-i̯é/ó-
formation is extremely controversial; see above all the objections by
Jasanoff, 1978, 64ff., 100 (for Germanic and Balto-Slavic); 2003, 155ff.;
2004, 127ff., and now Müller, 2007, 185ff.[44]

---

[40] This is not the proper place to give a detailed account of Ringe's theories
about how *-h₁-i̯é/ó- came to life; see most recently Ringe, 2006, 132.

[41] Hackstein, ll.cc., however, also proposes that some forms may rather go
back to factitives in *-eh₂-i̯e/o-, such as *orttotär* 'hält für richtig' which he
derives from *h₂r̥t-eh₂i̯e/o-.

[42] Which is claimed to denote a "Verbleiben in einem Zustand" and to be
associated with a fientive *eh₁*-aorist denoting "Eintreten in einen Zustand", as
per Harðarson, 1998, 334.

[43] But note that Rix, 1993, 337 still sided with the theory that the Tocharian
present Classes III/IV show the generalized thematic vowel *-o-.

[44] Ringe, 2006, 132f., 179 defends *-h₁-i̯é/ó-, or rather an "-ə-yé- ~ *-ə-yó-",
for Germanic.

26.5.2.3.   *Denominatives*

Winter 1960, 181f. was to my knowledge the first scholar to propose a denominative origin for at least some Class IV presents, evidently assuming at the time that the suffix of Class III reflected PIE *-ō-, and that of Class IV PIE *-ā-: "Denominative verbs with a present stem suffix B *o*, A *a* have a subjunctive stem in B *a*, A *a/ä*, cf. B *klautkoträ* 'becomes', subj. *klautkaträ* [sic] : *klautke* 'turn'; whatever the details, we will want to consider the difference in suffix as reflecting a contrast *ā : *ə, with *ə developed from *a*-coloring laryngeal (*A*); in turn, the analysis offering itself for the contrast B *e* : *ā* (stressed allophone of /a/) would be *ō : *ə, the *ə now representing *o*-coloring laryngeal *A*ʷ". In the 1965 version of his view on Tocharian evidence for laryngeals this passage is missing, but Winter, 1965, 193 and 207 = 2005, 109 and 123 at least refers to the existence of denominative preterit-subjunctive stems, and he does so also in Winter, 1990b, 2535f. = 2005, 415f.

   Somewhat similarly, Adams, 1978, 280; 1988a, 66f., and 1998, 616 suggested that certain Class IV presents are denominatives, which originally inflected as Class V presents, but then adopted Class IV inflection analogically under the influence of primary verb members of Class IV such as *osotär* from *ās*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'dry', which he claimed was "a convenient way of differentiating present from subjunctive when both were originally class V": e.g., *kleṅke* 'vehicle' → *klānkā- and *sware* 'sweet' → *swārā-. Adams, DoT, 425 adds *plonto-* from *plānt*ᵃ- 'rejoice, be glad', which "might be from *$ploh_1nd$-h_1-ó-, the thematic derivative of the *-eh_1- denominatives". As for the suffix underlying Class V formations, he refers to PIE factitive *-eh_2- > pre-PT *-ā-, which he believes to have resulted in PT *-ā-, not *-å̄-, despite his assertion that "without exception the base nouns for the Tocharian denominatives are PIE *o*-stems of the *tomos* type", with the exception of TB "*swārā*- 'to please'", which he calls "the only deadjectival formation" (Adams, 1988a, 66).

   Denominatives in *-eh_2-i̯e/o- as basis for Prs IV and likewise denominatives and deverbatives in PT *-äyä/æ- or *-æyä/æ- (in theory from *-i-i̯e/o-, *-ei̯e/o-, or *-e/o-i̯e/o-) as basis for Prs III are now also presupposed by Pinault, 2008, 433ff., 578ff. and 2009, 478f.

26.5.3. *Summary and final conclusions*

Ideally, all synchronic characteristics of Classes III and IV as listed above in the table should be accounted for by their diachronic analysis. However, instead of studying in detail that long list of various specific morphological and morphosyntactic traits, I will use a shortcut and ask which kind of presents inherited from PIE[45] could be expected to have existed beside the kind of preterits that are regularly associated with present Classes III and IV, i.e., Subclass 2/3 and Subclass 5 of Pt I, respectively.

As argued in chap. Pt I 7.3.4., the Subclass 2/3 preterits mostly go back to descriptively primary PIE zero-grade aorists in *-eh$_2$[(e)h$_1$]-, which are otherwise clearly attested in Baltic, Slavic, and Doric Greek; in Proto-Greek, this suffix must have had much the same function as, and must have been a mere variant of, the aorist morpheme *-eh$_1$- as attested in the almost exclusively intransitive η-aorists,[46] which share with the $\bar{a}$-aorists also both the zero-grade morphology and the exclusively active inflection. Since Baltic and Slavic lack a morphologically distinct middle voice, in order to see what kind of present formations should be expected beside PIE zero-grade aorists in *-eh$_2$[(e)h$_1$]- we therefore have to consult above all Greek.

As it turns out, beside intransitive zero-grade aorists in -η such as ἐσάπη, ἐτάρπη, and ἐτράφη we find quite often intransitive full-grade middle presents such as σήπομαι, τέρπομαι, and τρέφομαι, which regularly show thematic inflection, but have been claimed by Peters, 1975, 41 to continue mostly athematic Narten middle presents.[47] With respect to this evidence alone, there is hardly anything wrong with deriving Class III presents from thematic or rather athematic middle presents with generalized thematic vowel, or generalized athematic middle ending vowel pre-PT *-o-; as for the zero-grade of the root regularly showing up in Class III presents, this discrepancy between Greek and Tocharian could be neatly explained by paradigmatic leveling within Tocharian, and would not really require anyone to

---

[45] In the cases of Prs III and IV, it is quite obviously impossible to let these presents be built upon former preterits (i.e., aorists or perfects) via what I call the *tēzzi* principle.

[46] See Jasanoff, 2004, 163f.: "The oldest η-aorists in Greek seem to have been the replacements of middle root aorists."

[47] But note that in the case of unergative roots, an $\bar{e}/\bar{a}$-aorist may stand beside an active intransitive *-(i̯)e/o- present, which applies, e.g., to ῥέω and χαίρω (on the latter kind of present, see, e.g., Barton, 1989, 142f.).

accept the existence of athematic zero-grade presents of the PIE *lip-ór, *u̯aĝ-ór, and *u̯id-ór type as set up in Jasanoff, 2003, 157ff., 170f., 231f., and 2004, 159ff. made from what formerly seemed to Jasanoff himself to be rather aoristic roots with non-durative semantics. It should also come somewhat as a surprise that the middle ending *-o(r) was preserved here at all, since according to what Jasanoff teaches himself, at least *r*-less *-o must have been replaced within the history of (pre-)Tocharian by *-to even in the otherwise quite archaic-looking middle forms of the root preterit.[48] As for the alleged generalization of the thematic suffix variant *-o- within originally thematic paradigms, and especially originally thematic middle paradigms, Jasanoff himself already in 1978 thought that "the absence of *e*-timbre in the thematic conjugation" of Baltic was not original, but owed to a special sound change of Baltic, see Jasanoff, 1978, 48, § 42 with ref.; as for -*a*- in the Gothic middle, this might be a very special case as well, see Cowgill, 1985b, 145ff. = 2006, 441ff., and hence not to be compared with the Tocharian evidence; finally as for persistent -*a*- in Hittite thematic middle paradigms, this can have been triggered by the existence of language-specific athematic -*atta(ri)*, which undoubtedly started out as a blend of well-attested athematic -*a(ri)* with athematic -*tta(ri)*, and therefore cannot be taken for a corroborative parallel either.[49] Incidentally, if one opts for primary athematic or thematic middle formations as being basic to Class III presents, the absence of imperfects with palatalizing -*i*- would also defy explanation.[50]

On the other hand, any variant of the "*ē*-stative" solution advanced so far should rather be discarded. There are no traces of a preterit ending in suffixal pre-PT *-ē- which could have triggered the formation of present stems in pre-PT *-ē- via the *tēzzi* principle; and

---

[48] As for *ste*, I prefer the derivation from PIE *h₁sĝe-tor over the one from PIE *sth₂-o.

[49] The claim made by Rix, 1993, 337 that the South Picene *o*-perfect is also due to generalization of thematic *-o- is doubtful. Note that Jasanoff himself now does not believe in PIE middles in *-sĝotor anymore; see Jasanoff, 1998, 304 fn. 19; 2003, 50f.; 2004, 158.

[50] To be sure, Krause, 1950, 31 argued precisely that the non-palatalizing Imp suffix -*i*- goes back to thematic stems, the palatalizing to athematic ones, but this scenario can certainly *not* explain why the undoubtedly thematic stems of Class II precisely have non-palatalizing -*i*- as well. As is argued in chap. Imp 15.2., it rather seems that Tocharian had lost any trace of thematic *-o-ih₁- and generalized athematic *-ih₁- at a very early stage.

much as some Class III and IV presents seem to be reminiscent of so-called "stative" formations in other branches such as Germanic, Baltic, and Slavic (see, e.g., Jasanoff, 1978, 27f.; 2003, 155ff.; 2004, 159; Villanueva Svensson, 2003, 295),[51] evidence in favor of PIE *primary-looking* present formations with suffixal $*-eh_1-$ or $*-eh_1\underset{\,}{i}e/o-$ is clearly lacking, as per Jasanoff, 2004 and Peters, 2007, and derivation from $*-h_1-\underset{\,}{i}e/o-$ seems even to be excluded for phonological reasons, as per Jasanoff, 1978, 64ff., 100; 2003, 155ff.; 2004, 127ff. To judge from what Peters, 2007, 266ff. wrote, the only possible way to connect Class III presents somehow with the $*-eh_1-$ complex would be to derive them from PIE $*-e\underset{\,}{i}(h_1)e/o-$ presents,[52] and to assume systematic analogical depalatalization of the root-final consonants under the influence of the paradigmatically associated Pt I and Sub V forms. But even such a strategy could not explain the exclusive middle inflection and the irregular behavior with respect to imperfect formation.

It is not so clear to me whether in PIE, beside primary aorists in $*-eh_2[(e)h_1]-$, there existed related primary present formations in $*-eh_2[(e)h_1]-\underset{\,}{i}e/o-$ having the same root ablaut as the respective aorist. To be sure, various branches have presents of the Latin *dicāre* type, which probably derives from $*di\hat{k}ah_2-\underset{\,}{i}e/o-$ and clearly is *not* a denominative from a synchronic point of view; of course, it could have been such a formation diachronically, as per Steinbauer, 1989, 137f., but even the "*ā*"-aorists started out as denominatives themselves, according to Peters, 1997, 209ff. It would be speculative, but nevertheless quite reasonable, for Lat. *dicāre* < $*-\bar{a}\underset{\,}{i}e/o-$ to be based on an aorist stem $*di\hat{k}eh_2[(e)h_1]-$,[53] and to view the Latin subjunctive stem *dīcā-* as an analogically reshaped continuation of that same aorist stem $*di\hat{k}eh_2[(e)h_1]-$.[54]

However, such an analysis of the majority of Class III presents could not account for their exclusive middle inflection by itself; one

---

[51] To Ringe, 1991, 90 the resemblance seemed so striking that in his eyes it constituted then even "extremely powerfully evidence for an early connection between Germanic, BS, and Tocharian".

[52] Rasmussen, 1988, 169 only suggested "*-e\underset{\,}{i}e-* of causatives" as one of many possible sources.

[53] Note the claim made by Vendryes, 1911, 305 that the Latin presents of the *dicāre* type are "issus d'anciens aoristes", whatever he meant to imply by that statement.

[54] Peters, 1999, 310, fn. 44 suggested that what are usually taken for "Stativa" among the "got. 3. schwachen Präsensklasse" may derive from $*-ah_2\underset{\,}{i}e/o-$ formations as well.

would have to invoke analogical reshaping under the influence of the associated PT *wäyk(ā)tär-type presents which later turned into the respective subjunctives of the TB *wikātär* type (cf. chap. Pt I 7.3.4). It is therefore only fair to say that a derivation of the primary-looking core members of Prs Class III from inherited preforms in pre-PT *-ăi̯e/o- may be called morphologically less convincing than the Adams and Jasanoff approach.

But this is still not the final word on Class III presents, because a rather large minority among them, maybe even a bit more than one third, can hardly be primary formations at all, and are most probably rather denominative or deverbative formations. This undoubtedly holds for all Class III presents from Tocharian roots ending in -sk(ā)- and -tk(ā)-, and among them the so important and frequently used verb *mäsketär*, TA *mäskatär* 'become, be'. Of course, denominatives from nouns ending in PIE *-eh$_2$- can be expected to have formed pre-PT presents in *-ăi̯e/o-, and middle inflection of such presents could simply be a consequence of their (at least original) status as denominatives.[55] But then it is quite reasonable to assume that from the roots belonging to the majority of Class III presents, which look exactly like primary formations, originally only presents of the PT *wäyk(ā)tär type existed, i.e., present-stem formations identical with what later became the respective subjunctive formations in Tocharian B, and that all those *wiketär*-type presents were formed rather recently on the very model of the *mäsketär*-type denominatives, in

---

[55] To give just a few more examples, all the Class III presents with root vowel pre-PT *ē are also best explained as secondary formations. *tsenketär* 'arises' may be an old denominative present that by chance had lacked an old aorist; as for *ñewetär*, *lyewetär*, TA *śamantär*, TA *śalpatär*, and possibly again *tsenketär*, these forms may have started out as presents of the Latin *cēlāre* type; there are not too many such formations to be found in IE branches that preserved distinct middle forms, but Latin *uēnārī* certainly belongs here, and is a deponent (see Flobert, 1975, 53, fn. 5); note in addition that according to Steinbauer, 1989, 142, also the *cēlāre* type was of denominative origin. By preferring this analysis for *ñewetär*, of course I do not intend to claim that the pre-PT *ē-vowel met in this present has nothing to do with the primary verbal Narten formation that can be reconstructed for the respective root (as shown by Jasanoff apud Eyþórsson, 1993, 56, fn. 35); see Vine, 1998, 697, fn. 44 for a possible connection of lengthened grades in deverbal nouns and deverbatives with the existence of primary verbal Narten formations.

order to make a formal distinction between subjunctive use and indicative use possible.[56]

As for the presents of Class IV, these go regularly together with a Pt I from Subclass 5, and as has been argued in chap. Pt I 7.3.5., only a very small number among the members of the latter verbal category are best taken to be primary aorists in pre-PT *-ā- derived from roots with a root vowel pre-PT *(-ā-/)-a-, whereas the vast majority of its members are clearly aorists of denominatives from pre-PT *o*-stems. Now, as denominative presents made from PIE *o*-stems one expects precisely formations that ended either in *-oh₁-i̯e/o- or in *-ei̯e/o- in PIE,[57] and which in their capacity as denominatives became restricted to middle inflection within Tocharian. Accordingly, it is not unreasonable to derive at least most of the Class IV presents from PIE *-oh₁-i̯e/o- presents, and as a bonus we also get an explanation for TA *śalcantär* and TA *sparcwatär*, etc., which are evidently presents in pre-PT *-ei̯e/o- (notably with a root vowel pre-PT *o and not *ō), and hence may simply attest to a former state of affairs when beside denominative aorists in *-oh₁- derived from PIE *o*-stems there could exist respective denominative present formations both in *-oh₁-i̯e/o- and in *-ei̯e/o-.[58]

Note in addition that an *ī*-(optative/)imperfect made from a present stem ending in pre-PT *-a/ōi̯e/o- would probably have led to a stem ending in an (of course, non-palatalizing) morpheme PT *-āy-, which in all probability would have been identical with the verbal dual marker of PT, but certainly would not have been met in any other of the (optative/)imperfect forms. Accordingly, precisely in the

---

[56] See the quite parallel, although in my opinion incorrect, argument by Adams, 1978, 280; 1988a, 66f. on behalf of the clear denominatives among the Class IV presents. For the principle, cf. also the fact that in Tocharian B *prāskau* acts as both Prs V and Sub V from *pärsk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be afraid'; it is only TA that has an (irregular) Prs III or IV from this root, TA *praskatär*, which may have been an inner-TA innovation based on the Sub V.

[57] Of course, from *o*-adjectives also factitives in *-eh₂-(i̯e/o-) could have been formed, and Hackstein, 1998, 226; 2002a, 268, fn. 12 indeed claimed that TB *orttotär* is such a formation (i.e., "uridg. *h_2r-teh_2-i̯e/o- 'richtig machen, erscheinen lassen' oder 'Richtigkeit aussprechen'"); however, I rather think this is a derivative from a *full-grade substantive* *h₁ar-to-; root-initial *h₂- (or *h₃-) seems to be excluded by the Anatolian evidence, as per Cohen, 2002, 23f. with ref., and on the other hand, the zero grade of this root evolved into PT *ær-, as evidenced by TA *ort* 'friend' (see Hilmarsson, 1986, 23).

[58] A possible parallel from Vedic is suggested by Peters, 1999, 310, fn. 44.

case that one is willing to reconstruct the (optative/)imperfect forms made to Class III and IV presents as ending in pre-PT *-a/ōi̯ī-, it would not come as a huge surprise that their lautgesetzlich outcomes were eliminated in both branches of Tocharian, Tocharian B just substituting the unusual PT *-āy- by ubiquitous -i-, but Tocharian A simply resorting to the respective preterit forms, which must have been generally in use also as imperfect forms before optatives made from present stems were finally established as new imperfect forms.

In sum, I think it is not unreasonable to derive at least more than one third of Class III presents from secondary (denominative or deverbative) pre-PT *-ăi̯e/o- presents and almost all of Class IV presents from denominative pre-PT *-ōi̯e/o- presents; on the other hand, I think it is quite possible and reasonable to derive the majority of Class III presents and maybe also a very small minority of Class IV presents from athematic (or maybe thematic) primary formations (if one is willing to accept the existence of 3.sg. middle forms in pre-PT *-o-tor at all).

THE PRESENT OF CLASS V

27.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRESENT CLASS V

A present of Class V is attested from the 21 following verbs (14 TB, 10 TA, 3 TB = TA):

iyᵃ- 'go, travel, lead', *kärrᵃ*- 'scold', *kwᵃ*- 'call, invite', ᴬ*täkwᵃ*- '?', *tälp⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be purged', *nān⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'appear', *pärsk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be afraid', *pälwᵃ*- 'lament (tr/itr)', *pⁱᵃ*- '± trumpet', ᴬ*piwᵃ*- 'blow', ᴬ*plänkᵃ*- '± pinch', *mäk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'run', ᴬ*mäntᵃ*- 'destroy, be angry', ᴬ*räpᵃ*- 'dig, plow', *ruᵃ*-/ ᴬ*ruᵃ*- 'pull out', *läk⁽ᵃ⁾*-/ ᴬ*läk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'see, look', *läm⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'sit', ᴬ*wip⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'moisten', *śuwᵃ*-/ ᴬ*śuwᵃ*- 'eat, consume', ᴬ*şkitᵃ*- '± appear, seem', *suwᵃ*- 'rain'. Uncertain are: *nitt⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'collapse' (Prs I/V), *lyi(n)ᵃ*- '± place' (Prs V/VI), *räsᵃ?*- 'stretch (out)' (Prs V/XII), ᴬ*tsuw⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'stick together, obey' (mis-spelling?); perhaps also ᴬ*klāwᵃ*- 'announce'.

The following forms are attested:

	TB	TA
1.sg.act.	*prāskau*	*mäntām, lkām, śwām*
2.sg.act.	*prāskat, śwāt*	*lkāt, śwāt*
3.sg.act.	*iyaṃ, (nittaṃ,) prāskaṃ, palwaṃ, śuwaṃ*	*piwāṣ, lkāṣ, śwāṣ*
1.pl.act.	*pälwāmo*	*lkāmäs*
2.pl.act.	—	*lkāc*
3.pl.act.	*parskaṃ, pīyaṃ, śuwaṃ/ śwāṃ-ne, suwaṃ*	*mänteñc, lkeñc, śweñc*
1.sg.mid.	*kwāmar-c*	—
2.sg.mid.	—	—
3.sg.mid.	*kärratär* (sic), *kwātär-ne, nanātär, rwātär, lkātär, śwātär*	*lkātär*
1.pl.mid.	—	—
2.pl.mid.	—	*mäntācär*
3.pl.mid.	*kwāntär, lkāntär-c*	*mäntāntär, lkāntär, şkitāntär*
nt-Part	*śawāñca*	*lkānt, śwānt*
m-Part	*kwāmane, pälwāmane, swāmane*	*plänkāmāṃ, mäntāmāṃ, lkāmāṃ, śwāmāṃ*
Ger I	*kärrālle, tälpälle, pälwälle, ruwāllona, lkālle, śwālle*	*lkāl*
Abstr I	—	*lkālune*

Tocharian A has in addition the Inf forms:

täkwātsi, mäntātsi, rpātsi, rwātsi, lkātsi, wipāsi, śwātsi

Note that the existence of a Prs V implies the existence of a Sub V made from the same root.

27.1.1.   Ablaut

Schmidt, 1985, 425 states categorically that the present Class V does not show intra-paradigmatic ablaut in contrast to the subjunctive of Class V. This is indeed true for most examples, but at least in the case of the root *pärsk*[(ä)]- there can be found intra-paradigmatic ablaut between the active singular and the active plural in the Class V present, and the full grade in the singular goes further together with initial accent, i.e., we have to do with an accent/ablaut pattern like that found among the *ā*-subjunctives. The following diagnostic forms are attested: 1.sg. Prs *prāskau*, 2.sg. Prs *prāskat* (proving initial accent), 3.pl. Prs *praskaṃ*, Ger I *parskalle* (proving initial accent). Hackstein, 1995, 192, fn 58. claims that "die Präsensformen an den homomorphen Konj. V angeglichen sind",[1] which leads to the next question why other present Class V stems did not take on the ablaut pattern of the by far more productive subjunctive Class V as well. A closer look at the Class V presents and Class V subjunctives reveals, however, that almost in all of the other cases the corresponding subjunctive stem does indeed have the same ablaut/accent pattern as the present stem. This has not been pointed out before, probably because most of the involved stems lack ablaut.[2]

   There are just two, maybe three possible exceptions from this rule, and these come from *pi*[ä]- '± trumpet' with 3.pl.act. Prs *pīyaṃ* (and probably 3.pl. Imp *pyoyeṃ*) vs. Sub V/Pt I stem *pāyā*-, and *nitt*[(ä)]- 'collapse' with 3.sg.act. Prs *nittaṃ* in 88 b 4f. vs. Sub V/Pt I stem *naitā*-; note that the subjunctive and preterit stem of both roots show

------

[1] As for the PT *æ*-vocalism of the TB/TA present and TB subjunctive stem in *pärsk*[(ä)]-, Rasmussen, 1996 = 1999, 616f. suggests an analogy from the lengthened-grade sigmatic aorist stem *prēk̂-s- (which may be attested in the intransitive Pt III TA *prasku* 'I was afraid').

[2] Note that also the Class I subjunctive stems that are attested beside respective Class I presents never show intra-paradigmatic ablaut or irregular initial accent.

persistent full grade. A third example may come from Ger I *tsikale* from *tsik*ᵃ- 'form, shape' attested beside a Sub V/Pt I stem *tsaikā-*.

Both present forms *pīyaṃ* and *nittaṃ* can at first glance be analyzed as Class V formations, and this is indeed what Krause did in the case of *nittaṃ* (WTG, 254), but not in the case of *pīyaṃ*, which was analyzed by him as Class VI present (WTG, 73, § 77; 261). Adams, DoT, 337f. objects to the analysis of these two present stems as Class V presents arguing that "differing in root ablaut [i.e., between Prs V and Sub V] is otherwise unparalleled". Accordingly, Adams analyzes *nittaṃ* as Class I present by assuming a mere misspelling for †*nittäṃ*. He does not discuss the matter further, but it has to be pointed out that the manuscript where *nittaṃ* is attested (88 b 4f.) and which is in general written in standard Tocharian B, indeed does show such a misspelling of ⟨ta⟩ for expected ⟨ta̱⟩ in line b 5 (*postaṃ* for *posta̱ṃ*) among other errors that may be due to indiligent copying (such as *märsāne* for correct *pärsāte* in a 3).

As for *pīyaṃ* and *pyoyeṃ*, Adams, DoT, 383 analyzes them as subjunctive stem formations, but *pīyaṃ* is more likely a present form, and the unclear *pyoyeṃ* an imperfect. Since *pyoyeṃ* is in any case derived from an *ā*-stem, it is virtually impossible to dismiss *pīyaṃ* as a mere misspelling for a Prs I †*pīyäṃ* or a Prs VI form †*pīyanaṃ.* On the other hand, it may be possible to analyze *nittaṃ* as a Prs VI standing for *nitt<n>aṃ*, and in this case the assumption of a mere misspelling would not be that strange, because we would have to do with omission of a third part of an akṣara.[3]

In sum, while one cannot exclude that two out of the three present stem forms in question are misspelled, the chances are not very high that this is indeed the case. One therefore better takes these present stem forms at face value and accept that it was indeed possible to have a zero-grade Prs V stem beside a Sub V stem with persistent full grade.

A similar coexistence of a Sub V/Pt I with persistent full grade and a zero-grade present of Class I is indeed attested with certainty in Tocharian B, but only for the one single example from *miw*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'tremble' with Prs 3.sg. *miwäṃ* vs. Sub V/Pt I *maiwā-*, and the *m*-Part

---

[3] The form has indeed to be read as *nittaṃ* with some certainty, and not as †*nitnaṃ*, because ⟨na⟩ and ⟨ta⟩ as second members of an akṣara can be distinguished in this manuscript. Note that the left part of the manuscript on which *ttaṃ* is attested, is not to be found under the number 88 but has the THT number 1924.

(mi)wamane[4] showing that the present stem had accent according to the basic rule of Tocharian B. In Tocharian A, we have more examples of this very pattern: ^A*pik^ä*- 'paint, write' with Prs 3.sg. TA *pikäṣ*, etc., vs. Sub V/Pt I TA *peka-*; ^A*lik^ä*- 'wash' with Inf TA *līktsi/lyīktsi* vs. Sub V/Pt I TA *leka-*; and maybe also ^A*sip^ä*- 'anoint', which has a respective Sub V stem *sepa-* and a 3.sg.mid. Prs TA *siptär*, which can be either Prs I or Prs II; there are further examples of a Prs I associated with a Sub V not showing root ablaut different from that of the present stem: ^A*krop^(ä)*- 'gather' with Prs 3.sg.mid. *kroptär*, etc., beside Prs VI and Sub V, with no ablaut found with root at all; ^A*sälp^ä*- 'glow' with Prs 3.pl. TA *sälpiñc*, etc., vs. Sub V TA *sälpā-*. Accordingly, a Prs I **nittäṃ* beside a Sub V/Pt I stem *naitā-* would be far from unparalleled.

A different case of discrepancy between Prs V and Sub V is *suw^ä*-/*swās^(ä)*- 'rain', where the subjunctive (and the preterit stem and kausativum as well) show a stem allomorph *swāsā-*. Finally, the full-grade stem allomorph *śāwā-* showing up in the imperfect of *śuw^ä*- 'eat' and even in the *nt*-participle (*śawāñca*) most likely spread from the preterit, where that ablaut grade was indeed regular in the active plural stem (= Subclass 4 Pt I).

---

[4] This may be a restored form in 85 b 2, but the restoration is fairly certain; on the passage see most recently Schmidt, 2001, 315 with fn. 78.

THE PRESENT AND SUBJUNCTIVE OF CLASS VI

28.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRESENT AND SUBJUNCTIVE CLASS VI

The following 64 roots form a nasal present of Class VI (TB 46, TA 33, TB = TA 15):

ālp^a- 'stroke', *kānt^a*- 'rub (off)', *^Akārp^(a)*- 'descend', *kät^a*-/ *^Akät^a*- 'strew', *kätk^(a)*- 'cross, pass', *kärk^a*-/ *^Akärk^a*- 'rob, steal, remove', *kärs^(a)*-/ *^Akärs^(a)*- 'know, understand, recognize', *kärst^a*-/ *^Akärṣt^a*- 'cut off, destroy', *^Akäl^a*- 'lead, bring', *^Akälp^(a)*- 'obtain', *käl(t)s^a*- 'pour, (op)press', *kaut^a*-/ *^Akot^a*- 'split, cleave', *^Aknā*- 'know', *kraup^(a)*-/ *^Akrop^(a)*- 'gather, assemble, congregate', *klāp^a*- '± touch, investigate', *^Aklis^a*- 'sleep', *klup^a*- 'rub, squeeze', *kwäs^a*- 'lament', *tärk^a*-/ *^Atärk^a*- 'dismiss, emit', *täl^(a)*- 'carry, bear', *^Atpuk^(a)*- '± hide', *truk^a*- '± give, portion', *nätk^a*- 'hold distant, push away', *nuk^a*- 'swallow', *pärs^a*- act. 'sprinkle', mid. 'spray', *päl^a*-/ *^Apäl^a*- 'praise', *pälsk^a*- 'consider, think', *^Apäs^a*- '?', *pruk^(a)*- 'jump, leap (away)', *mān(t)s^(a)*- 'be sorrowful', *mänt^(a)*- 'stir', *^Amärs^a*- 'forget', *mus^(a)*-/ *^Amus^a*- 'rise, be pulled up', *mrausk^(a)*- 'feel disgust', *yäks^a*- 'entangle, embrace', *^Ayuk^a*- 'overcome', *rāp^a*- 'dig, plow', *räm^a*-/ *^Aräm^a*- 'bend, bow', *^Aräs^a*- 'stretch', *^Aräsw^a*- 'tear, pick', *rit^a*-/ *^Arit^a*- 'seek, long for', *lātk^a*- 'cut off', *lik^(a)*- 'wash', *^Awāt^a*- '± trust, stab', *wāl^a*- 'cover, surround, conceal', *wālts^a*- 'crush, grind', *^Awät^(a)*- 'put, place', *wänt^a*- 'cover', *wärt^a*- 'turn', *wärp^a*-/ *^Awärp^a*- 'enjoy, etc.', *^Awe-* act. 'let sprout', mid. 'sprout', *^Asäk^a*- '± follow', *sik^a*- 'step, set foot', *suk^a*-/ *^Asuk^a*- '± bring', *^Asum^a*- 'take away, deprive of', *skāy^a*-/ *^Askāy^a*- 'strive, attempt', *skär^a*- 'scold, reproach; threaten', *staukk^(a)*- 'swell', *tsāk^a*-/ *^Atsāk^a*- 'pierce, bite', *tsāp^a*- 'mash, squeeze', *tsärk^a*- 'heat, burn; torture', *tsālt^a*- 'chew', *^Atsäk^(a)*- 'pull, take out', *^Atsit^(a)*- 'touch'.
Uncertain is: *lyi(n)^a*- '± place' (Prs V/VI).

The following six roots form a nasal subjunctive of Class VI (6 TB, 3 TA, 3 TB = TA):

käry^a- 'buy, trade', *kälp^(a)*- 'obtain', *päk^a*-/ *^Apäk^a*- 'intend', *mäl^(a)*- '(op)press, crush; deny', *yäk^a*-/ *^Ayäk^a*- 'be careless', *yänm^(a)*-/ *^Ayom^(a)*- 'achieve, reach'.

On the (irregular) 3.sg.mid. Opt TA *päknāśitär* from *^Apäk^a*- 'intend' and 3.sg.mid. Opt TA *yäknāśśitär* from *^Ayäk^a*- 'be careless', see chap. Opt 23.2.2.

	TB Prs	TB Prs	TB Sub
	-änā-	*-nā-*	*-nā-*
1.sg.act.	*tärkanau-c*	*katnau*	*kallau*
2.sg.act.	*tärkanat*	—	*källāt*
3.sg.act.	*tärkanaṃ*	*katnaṃ*	*kallaṃ*
1.pl.act.	*tärkanam*	—	*källām*
2.pl.act.	*tärkanacer*	—	*yanmacer*
3.pl.act.	*tärkanaṃ*	*karsnaṃ*	*kallaṃ*
1.sg.mid.	*wärpanamar*	*pällāmar*	*päknāmar*
2.sg.mid.	*wärpnātar* (MQ)	—	—
3.sg.mid.	*wärpanatär*	*pällātär*	*päknātär*
1.pl.mid.	—	—	—
2.pl.mid.	—	—	—
3.pl.mid.	*wärpanantär*	*pällāntär*	*päknāntär*
nt-Part	—	—	
m-Part	*wärpanamane*	*kätnāmane*	
Ger/Abs	*wärpanalle*	*kätnālle*	*källālle*
Inf			*källātsi*

	TA	TA Sub
1.sg.act.	*kärsnām*	—
2.sg.act.	*kärsnāt*	*yomnāt*
3.sg.act.	*kärsnāṣ*	*yomnāṣ*
1.pl.act.	—	—
2.pl.act.	*kärsnāc*	*yomnāc*
3.pl.act.	*kärsneñc*	*yomneñc*
1.sg.mid.	*wärpnāmār*	—
2.sg.mid.	*rinātār*	—
3.sg.mid.	*wärpnātär*	—
1.pl.mid.	*wärpnāmtär*	—
2.pl.mid.	—	—
3.pl.mid.	*wärpnāntär*	—
nt-Part	*wärpnāntās*	
m-Part	*wärpnāmāṃ*	
Ger/Abstr	*wärpnāl*	*yomnālune*
Inf	*wärpnātsi*	

In the case of *kälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* the Priv *eṅkälpatte* shows that the nasal subjunctive stem is a secondary formation and that the original subjunctive stem was one of Class V, cf. Hilmarsson, 1991, 74f. A similar case is *yänmā-* from *yänm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'achieve', where we have mere **yäm-* still in Tocharian A. However, beside *yänmā-* we also seem to have an ablauting athematic subjunctive stem *yonmä-/yänmä-* attested in the 3.sg. *yonmäṃ* and in the Priv nom.sg. *ainmitte*, obl.

ainmacce, which must indeed derive from the stem *yänmā-*. Krause, WTG, 120, § 120 s.v. *yäm-* (who had no access to the attestations of the privative) seems to suggest that *yonmäṃ* is a secondary formation based on the Class III preterit *yonmasa* and furthermore on the model provided by Sub *wotkäṃ* : Pt III *otkasa* from *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'decide'. To be sure, *yonmäṃ* is attested in a text from Sängim and *ainmitte* in a graffito, so that these forms seem to belong to the informal variety of Tocharian B. The obl. *ainmacce*, on the other hand, is attested in an MQ text and is hence an old form, but being attested in the informal variety of Tocharian B does not necessarily mean that the respective form is a younger creation, because this variety can also preserve archaisms, so that *yonmä-/yänmä-* may just reflect an old athematic subjunctive stem pre-PT *i̯o(m)n-/*i̯äm-*.

A similar scenario may underlie the subjunctive stem of *mäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'crush, deny' that has a remarkable full-vowel form *māllā-* < *mæl-nā-*. Pace WTG, 138f., § 129, fn. 2 and § 131, this root forms a Class VI subjunctive from a synchronic point of view, and this subjunctive stem formation is also expected because of the correlated Class Xa present. The PT *æ-vowel must have been introduced from some other stem formation.

28.1.1. *Tocharian A and the problem of consonant clusters*

The forms with nasal suffix TA *-nā-* are subject to vowel balance, cf. TEB I, 203, § 367,2,[1] with the exception of 2.sg. *yomnāt*, 3.sg. *yomnāṣ*, 2.pl. *yomnāc*, and Abstr *yomnālune* from *ᴬyom⁽ᵃ⁾-*. This root thereby provides the only example of a suffix variant *-änā-* to be found in Tocharian A, and one that is clearly just owed to the difficulty of the cluster *-mn-*.

In both languages, addition of *-nā-* to a root-final consonant (cluster) may lead to assimilation in and/or simplification of the resulting consonant cluster or geminate, cf. TEB I, 203f., § 367,3.

A special problem arises with TA roots ending in TA °*tk*, °*sk*, °*rk*, and °*lk*, because these either persistently or sporadically show what looks like a metathesis of *°Cknā- resulting in °*Cäṅkā-* and what hence seem to be nasal-infix formations, cf., e.g., *ᴬkātkᵃ-* 'arise' with

---

[1] As a consequence, TG, 356f., §§ 441f. distinguished two classes: a Class VI with a suffix TA *-na-* after a "Wurzelvokal … stets lang" and a Class VII with a suffix TA *-nā-* after a "Wurzelvokal stets *ä*, *i* oder *u*". Note that WTG and TEB use here a classification system different from the one adopted in TG.

3.sg. TA *kātäṅkāṣ*. In contrast to the TB nasal-infix presents (= Class VII), they do not inflect like athematic Class I stems or thematically, but have a stem-final suffix TA *-ā-* and hence inflect like presents of Classes VI and V. Since they thereby from a purely descriptive point of view constitute a stem formation different from the usual Class VI stems, I assign these cases to a Class VII that is, however, synchronically also different from the usual TB Class VII. To be sure, I think that their diachronic background is nevertheless the same, as will be discussed in chap. Prs VII 29.3.

28.1.2.   *The TB suffix variants -nā-/-änā-*

TEB I, 203, § 367,1 states: "Im Wtoch. treten in der Gestalt des Suffixes die zunächst lautlich bedingten, dann analogisch vorgedrungenen und vermischten Wechselformen *-ana-* und *-nā-* auf, z.B. *wärpanatär* : *wärpnātär*". Thomas, 1979, 163ff. was the first to study the alternation *-änā-/-nā-* with respect to their appearance in prose or metrical passages. On the other hand, he also distinguished between different root structures. He claimed that roots with non-full root vowel ending in a single consonant and roots ending in a diphthong regularly had the allomorph *-nā-*, while roots with a different root structure regularly had the allomorph *-änā-*. That is, he was the first scholar[2] who tried to explain the TB variation *-nā-/-änā-* at least implicitly in terms of what may be called something like a Sievers' rule. In this he was later followed by Praust, 2004, 377 with fn. 18 and, most notably, by Kim, 2007b. However, as a consequence of his rule Thomas had to reckon with quite a few analogical leveling, because the actually attested forms do not completely conform to that rule at all; so on the one hand he explicitly did not care too much about "bloße Ausnahmen, wie sie [...] gelegentlich vorkommen" (Thomas, 1979, 171), but on the other hand also claimed with respect to the completely aberrant behavior of the root *kärst*[a]*-* 'cut off, destroy' that "der Typ *karsnaṃ*, *kärsnātär* [...] [sich] vielleicht gerade auch deswegen als alleingültig durchgesetzt [habe], um damit formale Überschneidungen mit der Wz. *kärs-* „wissen" zu vermeiden, die

---

[2] At least the first scholar with access to and a thorough knowledge of all the relevant forms, which cannot be said of Marggraf, 1970, 18; for other treatments of *-änā-* vs. *-nā-* see also VW II/2, 37; Adams, 1988a, 73f.; Pinault, 1989, 44; 2008, 587; Ringe, 1990, 232, fn. 31.

umgekehrt wieder anscheinend keine synkopierten Formen kennt".[3]
As it seems, Thomas also thought that all kinds of forms having the
suffix rendered by -nā- can be taken for syncopated variants of forms
with the suffix variant -änā-, by taking them probably for forms with
an accent shift to the right. At least in this respect he was followed or
at least joined by Winter, 1990, 381ff. = 2005, 403ff., who quite
explicitly interpreted forms such as kärsnātär (Š, metrical) as showing
both deletion of accented schwa in original *-ä́nā- and "pitch
transfer"[4] toward the right in a polysyllabic form. The most
remarkable difference between Thomas and Winter seems to me that
according to Winter, each Class VI present of Tocharian B had started
out as an *-änā-, and not as a *-nā- formation. However, as far as I can
judge, the latter claim by Winter is not correct at all. My impression is
that generally speaking, in Tocharian B a Class VI present stem has
either invariably the suffix variant -nā- or invariably the suffix variant
-änā-, with only three (or four) roots clearly not having been
completely restricted to one of the two groups.[5] As for the -änā- stems,
they may quite well show syncope of the accented -ä́- in metrical
passages. This becomes clear from the fact that whenever we have a
present stem with a variation between -nä̆- and -änā-, the -nä̆- forms
are usually confined to metrical passages only.[6] For that reason, I set
up a nā-only present stem whenever /nā/ is attested exclusively and
that in both prose passages and in metrical passages from non-MQ
texts (similarly Kim, 2007b, 78). On first sight, it seems difficult to
distinguish a nā-only stem from what is basically an -änā- stem that

---

[3] A propos of these two roots, quite the same suggestion was later also
made by Winter, 1990, 386f. = 2005, 408f., who, however, did not refer to
Thomas' proposal.

[4] See for the meaning of this term esp. Winter, 1990, 380f. = 2005, 402f. If I
understand him correctly, in his view after the TB loss of an accented (*)-ä- the
respective word form completely lacked stress, but had pitch on the next
syllable to the right (except in resulting disyllabic forms, where the pitch was
transferred to the initial syllable, i.e., the next syllable to the lost schwa on the
left), and that mere pitch could then be indicated in the writing (which was
done rarely) or not (which was rather the rule). As a matter of fact, in my view
there is no good evidence that the alleged pitch shift was ever indicated in the
writing at all.

[5] Kim, 2007b, 78ff. came basically to the same conclusion, but offers a
pattern different from the one presented here; see below.

[6] The only ambiguous form is the 3.sg. Imp pälsknoy in the small fragment
417 from Murtuq, where it is unclear whether we are dealing with a prose or a
metrical passage.

shows a suffix allomorph *-nǎ-* in metrical texts, but it has to be emphasized that forms with a monosyllabic suffix allomorph occurring beside *-änā-* forms from the same root show a writing of the monosyllabic suffix variant that differs from the writing of the suffix in forms from *nā*-only stems: whereas *-nā-* stems in non-MQ texts always show accent on the suffix and hence are written with ⟨nā⟩, what seems to be *-nǎ-* forms resulting from syncope behave like metrically syncopated forms of other categories, as was shown by Thomas, l.c., and Winter, l.c. Crucial forms to show this are, as pointed out by both authors, the 3.sg. and 3.pl. *tärknaṃ* attested beside 3.sg. and 3.pl. *tärkanaṃ.* As Winter correctly remarks, in *tärknaṃ* "[n]either the first nor the second (phonological) syllable shows a graphic indication of accent". This is, in fact, exactly the usual outcome of schwa deletion in metrical texts as met in, e.g., the adjective form *kätkre*, which is a syncopated variant of *kätkare*.[7] As for the 3.sg.mid. *kraupnatär* and 3.pl.mid. *kraupnantär* (beside non-syncopated *kraupanatär*)[8] from *kraup⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'gather' and 3.pl.mid. *mrausk⟨n⟩antär* (cf. also the MQ form 3.sg.mid. *mrausknātär* from *mrausk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'feel disgust'), we strictly speaking cannot see whether the root syllable bears the accent, but we certainly see that the accent is not on the suffix /nā/ as is always the case with stems that only show the suffix allomorph *-nā-.*

By these standards, one will have to acknowledge a variation *-nā- ~ -änā-* for very few roots only, the most certain cases being *täl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'carry', *nätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'hold distant', *wärpᵃ-* 'enjoy', and possibly *kärkᵃ-* 'rob, steal, remove' with *kärknāmane* from the metrical non-MQ text PK AS 15D a 2 on the one hand, and the metrical MQ form *kärkänoytär* on the other hand.[9] The nasal present from *wärpᵃ-* 'enjoy' is attested quite often and shows metrically syncopated forms like 1.sg.mid.

---

[7] For these strange spellings, which at least at first glance seem to imply that the syncopated forms lacked accent (or at least stress or pitch) completely, see above all Winter, 1990, 371ff. = 2005, 393ff. A thorough discussion of this issue is beyond the scope of this study.

[8] Pace Thomas, 1979, 166, one cannot restore a syncopated active form *k(rau)pnaṃ* in H 149.add 65 b 5; see the discussion s.v. *kraup⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'gather'.

[9] Here maybe also belong *tärkᵃ-* 'dismiss', if //// *tarknaṃ* found in the small fragment 147 frg. a b 3 is indeed a 3.sg. Prs from this root (thus Thomas, 1979, 169) and *skāyᵃ-* 'strive', if *(skai)naman(e)* is restored correctly in 81 a 1; otherwise only a lot of *-nā-* forms are found from that root; see Thomas, 1979, 165.

wärpnamar (Š) or 3.pl.mid. *wärpnantär.*[10] Beside these, however, we find the 3.sg.mid. *wärpnātär* (attested in 521 b 1, Š; K 6 b 5 and 6; H 149.290 b 4) and the *m*-Part *wärpnāmane* (H add.149 77 a 5) in what seem metrical passages from non-MQ texts (cf. the list in Thomas, 1979, 169f.).[11] As for *täl*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'carry', clear evidence for *täl-nā- is provided by the accent and the -*ll*-[12] of the two forms 3.sg. *tallaṃ* and Ger I *tällälle* hailing from a non-MQ text, whereas the two forms *tlanatär-ñ* and *tlanantär-ñ* clearly attest to a pre-TB stem variant *täl-änā-. As for *nätk*⁽ᵃ⁾-, cf. the 3.sg. *natknaṃ* (attested in a Šorčuq metrical text) beside syncopated *nätknalle* (from another Šorčuq metrical text).

However, if any TB root would have been capable of having such a variation in the suffix, i.e., if from any given root -*nā*- variants would have been available, why did the poets then not simply just choose such -*nā*- variants whenever they were in need of a variant with one syllable less to be counted? On the other hand, if a stem invariably has the suffix variant -*nā*- in prose passages, it also has the suffix rendered by (*)-*nā*- in metrical non-MQ texts (cf. the situation with *pälᵃ̈*-, the forms are listed in Thomas, 1979, 164), i.e., in most cases a metrically syncopated -*nă*- form and a form of a *nā*-only stem are distinguishable in metrical texts. Note further that the subjunctive stem formations of Class VI always show a suffix allomorph -*nā*- and, what is more, that for these Sub VI forms there is no example of a writing of the type *tärknaṃ* attested in metrical passages of non-MQ texts, i.e., no Class VI subjunctive seems to show a metrical syncope of *ắ, so that all members of Sub Class VI seem to have been *nā*-only stems.

Accordingly, I think that indeed only very few roots can have known and shown such a variation, and that most of the TB roots forming Class VI presents have been either *nā*-only or *änā*-only roots. Thus, we have to do with the following -*nā*- and -*änā*-/ (metrical) -*nă*- nasal stems in Tocharian B:

---

[10] More examples of this type can be found in unpublished manuscripts such as THT 1253 a 4, THT 1254 a 4, THT 1266 a 2, THT 2377 frg. h a 4.

[11] The form *wärpānantär* (sic) attested in 17 a 5 (Š) obviously has to be an error. The other examples with -*nā*- given by Thomas all come from MQ texts. It would be quite arbitrary to claim that all instances of ⟨nā⟩ found in non-MQ texts were merely due to copying from original texts with MQ character, or exceptional cases of indicating pitch shift in writing (as done by Kim, 2007b, 78).

[12] Syncopated *tälán- should have resulted in TB †*täln*- with preserved -*ln*- to judge from *käln*- 'resound' < PT *klän- < pre-PT *klun- (as per Adams, DoT, 171).

The variant *-änā-*

ālp^a- 'stroke', *kānt^a-* 'rub (away)', *kätk$^{(a)}$-* 'cross, pass', *kärk^a-* 'rob, steal, remove' (also *-nā-*), *kärs$^{(a)}$-* 'know', *kaut^a-* 'split, cleave', *kraup$^{(a)}$-* 'gather', 'assemble, congregate', *klāp^a-* '± touch; investigate', *tärk^a-* 'dismiss, emit' (also *-nā-* ?), *täl$^{(a)}$-* 'carry, bear' (also *-nā-*), *nätk^a-* 'hold distant' (also *-nā-* ?), *pälsk^a-* 'consider, think', *mān(t)s^a-* 'be sorrowful', *mänt$^{(a)}$-* 'stir', *mrausk$^{(a)}$-* 'feel disgust', *yäks^a-* 'entangle, embrace', *rāp^a-* 'dig, plow', *rit^a-* 'seek', *lātk^a-* 'cut off', *lik$^{(a)}$-* 'wash' (Prs VI stem: *laikänā-*), *wāl^a-* 'cover, surround, conceal', *wālts^a-* 'crush, grind', *wänt^a-* 'cover', *wärp^a-* 'feel, etc.' (also *-nā-*), (possibly *skāy^a-* 'strive, attempt',) *staukk$^{(a)}$-* 'swell', *tsāp^a-* 'mash, squeeze', *tsält^a-* 'chew', *tsārk^a-* 'heat, burn; torment'.

The variant *-nā-*

kät^a- 'strew' (attested often), *kärk^a-* 'rob, steal, remove' (once *-nā-*, once *-änā-*, both metrical), *kärst^a-* 'cut off, destroy' (attested often), *käl(t)s^a-* 'pour, (op)press' (attested once in prose), *klup^a-* 'rub, squeeze' (attested twice in prose), *kwäs^a-* 'lament' (attested three times, once in prose), (possibly *tärk^a-* 'dismiss, emit',) *täl$^{(a)}$-* 'carry, bear', *truk^a-* '± give, portion' (once attested in prose), (possibly *nätk^a-* 'hold distant',) *pärs^a-* act. 'sprinkle', mid. 'spray' (attested four times, twice in prose), *päl^a-* 'praise' (attested often), *pruk$^{(a)}$-* 'jump, leap (away)' (attested four times), *mus$^{(a)}$-* 'rise, be pulled up' (attested twice in metrical texts, one of them MQ), *wärt^a-* 'turn' (attested once in prose), *wärp^a-* 'feel, etc.' (attested quite often; also *-änā-*), *suk^a-* '± bring' (attested three times in prose), *skāy^a-* 'strive, attempt' (attested often; also *-änā-* ?), *skär^a-* 'scold, reproach; threaten' (attested four times, three times in prose), *tsāk^a-* 'pierce, bite' (attested three times, twice in prose).

The following present stems are unclear, because crucial forms are only attested in metrical MQ texts and may therefore show either syncope of the allomorph *-änā-* or the allomorph *-nā-* in the first place: *nuk^a-* 'swallow' (3.sg. *nuknaṃ*), *räm^a-* 'bend, bow' (3.pl. Imp *rämnoyeṃ*, see Hackstein, 1995, 22, fn. 22, who claims that surfacing *-mn-* implies underlying *-män-*),[13] *sik^a-* 'step, set foot' (3.sg. *siknaṃ*).

My figures differ from those given by Kim, 2007b, 79f. Kim assumes a pattern by which roots containing a full vowel (*ā, e, o,* or a diphthong) belong to the *-änā-* class; this is correct but for two counterexamples (from *skāy^a-* 'strive' and *tsāk^a-* 'pierce, bite'); roots containing a non-full vowel *ä* followed by two consonants also belong to the *-änā-* class, according to Kim, while those containing *ä* followed

---

[13] Kim, 2007b, 84, fn. 36 seems to argue against this assumption, but as far as I understand him, he merely claims that the sequence *-mn-* could in theory be analogically restored.

by just one single consonant he says belong to the *nā*-only class. In this case, there are even more counterexamples that can be brought forth. Kim himself acknowledges the cases of *täl*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'carry, bear' (an *-änā*-stem with the structure CäC-änā-) and *kärst*ᵃ- 'cut off, destroy' (a *nā*-only stem with the structure CäRC-nā- from *CäRCC-nā-) as "real exceptions to this pattern". In addition, one has to adduce *rit*ᵃ- 'seek' (an *änā*-stem with the structure CäWC-änā-), *käl(t)s*ᵃ- 'pour', *pärs*ᵃ- 'sprinkle, spray', and *wärt*ᵃ- 'turn' (*nā*-only stems with the structure CäRC-nā-).

While *wärt*ᵃ- is a newly attested form, I cannot follow Kim's ways of explaining away the other counterexamples. As for *skāy*ᵃ-, Kim, 2007b, 84, fn. 35 states that *skāy-änā- may show loss of *ä after glide, but we have a morpheme boundary here where such a loss would not be expected. In the case of *tsāk*ᵃ- 'pierce, bite', Kim, 2007b, 81 with fn. 30 admits that this is an unexplained counterexample. As for *rit*ᵃ- 'seek', Kim, 2007b, 85, fn. 36 proposes that *(r)itanaṃ* may just be due to a metrical "Zerdehnung" of *ritnā-, a device already resorted to by Thomas, 1979;[14] on the other hand, Kim rightly remarks that it is very unlikely that such a metrical "Zerdehnung" was a device of Tocharian poetry in the first place. In any case, there is a second attestation of the stem *ritänā-* found in a prose letter (see Schmidt, 1997, 236f.).[15] As for *pärs*ᵃ- 'sprinkle', Kim, 2007b, 96, fn. 57 follows Thomas, 1979, 172 in assuming that the two attestations of the Ger I *pärsnālle* from the medical prose texts Fill. M 3 b 7 and Fill. W 42 a 4 may be explained as "syncopated variants [...] in colloquial language". However, the same strategy could then in theory be advanced in every instance where we have *-nā-* forms in prose texts, e.g., also in the case of *truknālle* attested once in the medical text 497 b 5, and as has been argued above, it is highly doubtful that non-MQ forms with ⟨nā⟩ can be taken for syncopated forms at all. As for *kärst*ᵃ- 'cut off' and *käl(t)s*ᵃ- 'pour', Kim, 2007, 86ff. advances the theory that the roots had schwebeablaut (still to be seen in the subjunctive) also introduced into the zero

---

[14] Thomas quotes the form without reference. I am unable to identify the text in question.

[15] Schmidt assumes that the formation of the present stem of *rit*ᵃ- as a whole may be an informal-style innovation, because there exists another present with the same meaning that is found more often, viz. from the root *ñäsk-* 'seek'. But I find this difficult to believe, since both roots seem to have fully developed, common-looking paradigms. Schmidt does not comment on *(r)itanaṃ*.

grades, so that there was a difference in root structure (viz. *kräst-, *kläts-) at the time the nasal stem was formed. As for *täl⁽ᵃ⁾- 'carry, bear', Kim, 2007b, 84f., fn. 36 seems to suggest that the middle present stem *tälänā- was analogically created in order to achieve a "disambiguation of pres. and subj.".[16] However, precisely the finite forms of that subjunctive stem have evidently not been in use, and the possibly attested non-finite forms have an unexpected shape: Ger II *tälle* said to be due to a haplology (which then could be derived from both a Sub V and Sub VI stem), and the once attested Inf *tällätsi* that rather points to a Sub I stem.[17] The subjunctive stem of this root is usually provided by the more or less synonymous Kaus. III paradigm, i.e., a Sub IXb stem.

All in all, Kim's various arguments concerning counterexamples to his rule fail to convince, and one has to conclude that regardless of his amendments proposed for the proto-history of Tocharian (B), also the kind of Sievers' rule set up by Kim is quite incapable of explaining the historical distribution of the two TB suffix variants *-änā- and *-nā-. As far as I can see, for the two groups of TB Class VI presents no kind of synchronical complementary distribution can be observed at all — neither with respect to root shape, nor with respect to TA cognates, the ablaut/accent patterns of the respective subjunctive stems, or the inflection of the respective preterit stems. To sum up, no synchronically valid principle can account for the historical distribution; accordingly, diachrony has to be called in.

28.2.   DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

The Class VI nasal presents and subjunctives of Tocharian are, of course, usually derived from the PIE nasal presents in *-neH-/*-nH-, cf. the ref. in VW II/2, 36ff.; for the generalization of the zero grade of the suffix, compare, e.g., the generalization of zero-grade *-nC- in the nasal presents of Class VII. As for the TB suffix variant -änā-, it was mentioned above that there seems to be a clear, and quite natural, preference for being used after heavy or very heavy syllables, but it has also been pointed out that the actual distribution cannot be explained by some sound law reminiscent of Sievers' rule. Since this

---

[16] It is strange that at the same time Kim, 2007b, 87 opposes to the same kind of "functional explanation" invoked by other scholars with regard to preventing "homophony between 'know' and 'cut off/down'".

[17] Maybe the form even stands for the Sub IXb Inf *tälästsi.*

variant seems to be completely absent from both the non-productive category of TB Class VI subjunctives and the TA Class VI formations in general (with the exception of pre-TA *yomänā-), I think it is a likely assumption that -*änā*- may not even have been a PT suffix variant yet, but may just have spread analogically within pre-TB times from a very small nucleus. A likely candidate for the starting point of the whole subcategory may be the Prs VI of *täl*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'carry', since from this root there are indeed both kinds of formation attested, and since it is quite unlikely that after a light syllable such as *täl*- the suffix variant -*änā*- was just introduced analogically. One may guess that when *-ln- had been turned into -*ll*- in the Class VI formation from this root by sound law, the original sequence had been restored by some speakers analogically, and that these speakers of Tocharian B then inserted a prop vowel *-ä- between the *-l- and the *-n- in order to prevent the assimilation *-ln- > -*ll*- from taking place anew at a time when *klän- 'resound' still had not turned into *käln*-.[18]

---

[18] One may compare the non-Aeolic dialects of Ancient Greek, where there are three results of underlying *-ln- in nasal presents: beside seemingly preserved -λν- there is compensatory lengthening on the one hand, and -λλ- on the other hand, i.e., also in these dialects *-ln- happened to be restored, and afterwards could hardly resist to assimilation again. A similar argument could be made on behalf of *wärp*ᵃ- 'enjoy', since pre-PT *-pn- evidently tended to turn into TB -*nm*-, as per Adams, DoT, 685. Note in addition that in TA in the one example of *-änā- the *-ä-vowel probably served the same purpose of preventing a difficult consonant cluster (cf. Hackstein, 1995, 22 fn. 22 on -*mn*- < *-män- in TB; accordingly, a *rämänā- may have provided a further nucleus).

THE PRESENT OF CLASS VII

29.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT THE TB PRESENT CLASS VII

A nasal present of Class VII is made from the following eleven roots in Tocharian B:

kätk$^{(a)}$- 'cross', *kutk$^{a?}$-* 'embody', *klutk$^{(a)}$-* 'turn', *nätk^{a}-* 'keep, push away', *pärs^{a}-* act. 'spray', mid. 'sprinkle', *pik^{a}-* 'pain, write, form', *putk$^{(a)}$-* 'divide, separate, distinguish', *rätk$^{a?}$-* '± (a)rise', *rutk^{a}-* 'remove, take off', *särk$^{(a)}$-* '± take care of', *sälk^{a}-* 'pull, show'.

Probably also: *mäk$^{(a)}$-* 'run' (if Imp *makoymar* stands for *ma<ṅ>koymar*).

The following forms are attested:

	Athematic	Thematic
1.sg.act.	—	—
2.sg.act.	—	—
3.sg.act.	*kättaṅkäṃ/kättaṅkaṃ, nättaṅkäṃ, prantsäṃ, puttaṅgaṃ* (sic), *sraṅkäṃ*	—
1.pl.act.	—	—
2.pl.act.	—	—
3.pl.act.	*kättaṅkäṃ, piṅkäṃ*	*puttaṅkeṃ, rättaṅkeṃ, sräṅken-ne*
1.sg.mid.	—	*ruttaṅkemar*
2.sg.mid.	—	—
3.sg.mid.	*puttaṅktär, slaṅktär*	—
1.pl.mid.	—	—
2.pl.mid.	—	—
3.pl.mid.	—	*kluttaṅkentär, slaṅkentär*
nt-Part	—	—
m-Part	*kutäṅkmane*	*piṅkemane*
Ger/Abs	*piṅkalle, puttaṅkälle, slaṅkälle*	—

This present stem class usually inflects athematically, and like most athematic stems it can show secondary thematization; see Adams, 1978, 279, fn. 7; independently Schmidt, 1985, 426ff., and most recently Kim, 2007b, 67f. and Peyrot, 2008, 137. Peyrot in addition supports this theory by showing that no thematic forms are yet attested in archaic

texts. Note further that the thematic endings 3.pl.act. *-eṃ*, 1.sg.mid. *-emar*, 3.pl.mid. *-entär*, and *m*-Part *-emane* are precisely the ones that intruded most easily into other athematic classes as well; see chap.s Sub I 18.1. and Prs I 24.1.2.[1]

However, I do not think that the athematic *ä*-inflection is the original one either, because there are at least four forms with nasal infix showing an ending *-aṃ* instead of *-äṃ*: *kättaṅka(ṃ)* in H add.149 86 (= IOL Toch 213) b 1 (see Peyrot, 2008, 144) and probably also *puttaṅgaṃ* in the bilingual text PK NS 13 + 516 a 5 (see Couvreur, 1967, 154).[2] Further, here belongs the twice-attested 3.pl. MQ form *kämtaṃ* from *kät^a-* 'strew'. Because of the apparent nasal infix of this stem variant, Schmidt, 1985, 428 analyzed it as Prs VII formation standing beside the well-attested Prs VI stem of this root (*katnaṃ*, etc.). But Schmidt did not comment on the fact that we apparently have to do with an ending *-aṃ*, not *-äṃ*,[3] and although both attestation come from texts with MQ character, *-aṃ* cannot simply be regarded as an MQ writing for *-äṃ*, because in MQ texts /ä/ is precisely not rendered by ⟨a⟩.[4] Peyrot, 2008, 151 further shows that there are even three more attestation of a stem *käntā-*,[5] and points out that all forms of this stem variant come from texts with MQ character, while the Prs VI forms are mostly attested in standard texts. Peyrot correctly states that *käntā-* is not so much a Prs VII variant,[6] but a Prs

---

[1] According to Schmidt, l.c., and 1994a, 224 the 3.pl. *piṅkeṃ* listed in TEB is a ghost form; however, if it does exist it can easily be another example of secondary thematization.

[2] In this case, however, we cannot exclude that the double *ä*-dots were merely omitted by mistake, because for obvious reasons no fremdzeichen ⟨ga⟩ existed and the use of ⟨ga⟩ is odd in any case.

[3] His statement ("Neben *piṅkäṃ* sind noch weitere — bisher verkannte — Formen der 3. Pl. auf *-äṃ* überliefert: *kämtaṃ* 545 a 5 und *känta-ne* (für *käntaṃ-ne*, mit suffigiertem Pronomen) H 149.44 a 3") suggests that he deems *-aṃ* to be a mere graphic variant for *-äṃ*.

[4] See chap. Sound Laws 1.3. and Peyrot, 2008, 33ff.

[5] Note that in the archaic MQ manuscript THT 1535 it is quite certain that we have a stem *känta-* and not †*kätna-*, because in this manuscript ⟨t⟩ and ⟨n⟩ can still be well distinguished. While the akṣara ⟨nta⟩ is in most manuscripts hardly distinguishable from ⟨tna⟩, it is also certain that the stem allomorph of the Prs VI is indeed *kätnā-* (and not †*käntā-*) judging by *katnau* in the MQ text 205 a 3.

[6] The fact that *käntā-* is older also makes it much less preferable to assume that this is a Class XII stem standing beside Prs VI (as proposed by Schmidt, l.c., and Kim, 2007b, 71, fn. 14 as an alternative to Prs VII), because it is

VI form having undergone metathesis of *tn* to *nt* by sound law. In my opinion, this is indeed the best way to explain the whole Class VII of Tocharian B with the exception of *piṅk-*, and also the TA Class VII in *-ṅkā-*, as will be argued below.

As for the geminated *-tt-* in nasal-infix presents of *tk*-roots (*kättaṅkäṃ*, etc.), the *-t-* may have been geminated in these forms in order to preserve the syllable-final pronunciation of the *-t-* that was otherwise regular in forms from roots in *-tk*; note as a parallel from Tocharian A the stem *spārtwV/C-* (always written with a single *-t-*) vs. 3.sg. Pt I TA *spārttu.*

29.2. THE TA PRESENT CLASS VII

As was noted in chap. Prs VI, roots ending in TA °*tk*, °*sk*, °*lk* always and partly those in °*rk* show a nasal present stem formation different from both the normal Class VI stem formation with a suffix TA *-nā-* and also from the TB nasal-infix presents of Class VII, because the TA nasal presents derived from these roots show nasal infixation combined with *ā*-inflection. For this reason, I take this special group of TA nasal presents at face value and assign it to a class different from the other TA Class VI stem formations. I call this class "VII" first for purely economical reasons without wanting to imply by that right from the start that the TA Class VII and TB Class VII are identical (regardless of a diachronic connection that is discussed below).

The following 15 roots form such a nasal present in Tocharian A (in brackets I indicate the corresponding TB present class if attested):

$^A kātk^a$- 'arise', $^A kätk^{(a)}$- 'cross', 'pass' (TB Prs VI + VII), $^A päl(t)sk^a$- 'think' (TB Prs VI), $^A putk^a$- 'divide, separate' (TB Prs VII), $^A māsk^{(a)}$- 'be difficult', $^A mälk^a$- 'put together', $^A mrosk^{(a)}$- 'feel disgust' (TB Prs VI), $^A lotk^a$- 'turn' (TB Prs IV, sic), $^A rutk^a$- '(re)move' (TB Prs VII), $^A lātk^a$- 'cut off' (TB Prs VI), $^A wāsk^{(a)}$- 'move, quake' (TB Prs XII), $^A wnisk^a$- '± crush, torment', $^A wrātk^a$- '± prepare, handle (meat)', $^A särk^a$- '± take care of' (TB Prs VII), $^A spāltk^{a?}$- '± strive for' (TB Prs IXa).

Probably also: $^A pris$- '± sprinkle' (or Prs VIII).

---

difficult to find a motivation for the creation of a secondary deverbative Prs XII that was abandoned again in the later language. Prs XII is much more productive and hence one would expect an attestation of such a Prs XII in the later language. The case of Prs VI *mintanaṃ* 'stir (clay)' beside Prs XII *mäntaññeṃ*, etc. from *mänt^{(a)}*- 'destroy' cannot furnish a parallel, because this Prs XII stem reflects inherited *°-n-h₂-i̯e/o- (see Hackstein, 1995, 29f.), and *mintanaṃ* synchronically belongs to a different paradigm.

1.sg.act.	*pältsäṅkām*	1.sg.mid.	*rutäṅkāmār*
2.sg.act.	*sräṅkāt*	2.sg.mid.	*pältsäṅkātār*
3.sg.act.	*pältsäṅkāṣ*	3.sg.mid.	*wāsäṅkātär*
1.pl.act.	—	1.pl.mid.	*rutäṅkāmtär*
2.pl.act.	—	2.pl.mid.	—
3.pl.act.	*pältsäṅkeñc, lotäṅke*	3.pl.mid.	*wāsäṅkāntär*
nt-Part	—		
m-Part	*pältsäṅkāmāṃ, mläṅkmāṃ*		
Ger/Abstr	*kātäṅkāl*		
Inf	*pältsäṅkātsi, pältsäṅkāsi*		

As for the TB cognates of these TA nasal presents, they are members of the nasal stem Class VI,[7] or Class VII,[8] or show attestations of both Classes VI and VII,[9] or they have a different, non-nasal present stem formation.[10]

29.3. DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

It is customary to derive this special group of TA nasal presents from the usual Class VI presents in TA *-nā-* by assuming a rather purely phonologically conditioned metathesis of *°Ck-nā-* to *°C-n-k-ā-*, which is indeed the generally accepted view (TG, 356f., § 442; Couvreur, 1947, 61, § 103,b;[11] TEB I, 204, § 367,4; Lane, 1965, 72 = 1967, 102). Note that not every root-final cluster with *°k* shows this kind of formation: the root-final clusters TA *°tk* and *°sk* always show nasal infixation, but roots in *°rk* may show either suffixation or infixation: [A]*kärk[ä]*- 'rob' forms TA *kärnā-*, [A]*tärk[ä]*- 'emit' TA *tärnā-*, but [A]*särk[ä]*- '± take care' TA *sräṅkā-*; the only example for a root ending in *°lk* shows again infixation: [A]*mälk[ä]*- 'put together' with the *m*-Part TA *mläṅkmāṃ* that

---

[7] *pälsk[ä]*-/[A]*päl(t)sk[ä]*- 'think' TB Prs VI *pälskänā-*; *mrausk[(ä)]*-/[A]*mrosk[(ä)]*- 'feel disgust' TB Prs VI *mrausknā-*; [AB]*lātkā-* 'cut' TB Prs VI *lātkänā-*.

[8] *putk[(ä)]*-/[A]*putk[ä]*- 'divide'; [AB]*rutk[ä]*- 'remove'; and probably *särk[(ä)]*- /[A]*särk[ä]*-.

[9] [AB]*kätk[(ä)]*- 'cross' TB Prs VI *kätkänā-*.

[10] *klautk[(ä)]*-/ [A]*lotk[ä]*- 'become' TB Prs IV; *wäsk[(ä)]*-/ [A]*wäsk[ä]*- 'move' TB Prs XII; *spālk[ä?]*- /[A]*spāltk[ä?]*- '± strive for' TB Prs IXa.

[11] Couvreur, 1947, 61, § 103,b points out the fact that roots with full root vowel show a suffix not subjected to weakening by vowel balance (cf. TA *kātäṅkāṣ* from [A]*kātk[ä]*-), which is, however, not a serious problem for the metathesis theory, because one could assume that vowel balance came into operation after the metathesis.

most remarkably seems to lack the *ā*-stem character (i.e., not †*mlänkāmāṃ*).

In contrast, for some reason unclear to me, Pedersen, 1941, 172f. did not like the idea that the metathesis °*k-nā-* > °*ṅ-k-ā-* occurred "in rein lautlicher Weise", followed by Van Windekens, 1944, 247f. and (a bit differently) VW II/2, 41f., § 48. If I understand Van Windekens correctly, he finally wanted all instances of metathezised -*ṅk-* to be exclusively analogy-induced, i.e., to be based on the sole model of *piṅk-*, despite the fact that all instances of (*)-*kn-* had been followed by (*)-*ā-* while *piṅk-* had not, and that a lautgesetzlich preservation of (*)-*kn-* would have been strongly supported by both intra- and interparadigmatic pressure. Extremely unlikely as Van Windekens' approach is, the sole model of *piṅkä-* may indeed have to be invoked in order to explain the strange fact that in Tocharian B a sequence -*ṅkä-* also shows up in all those members of present Class VII for which a sequence (*)-*ṅkā-* was to be expected and is indeed (mostly) still attested in Tocharian A; see already Melchert, 1978, 99 and Adams, 1988a, 68, both of whom seem to assume that a purely phonologically motivated metathesis *-*tknā-* > *-*tn̥kā-* already occurred in Proto-Tocharian, and that in Tocharian B expected (*)-*ṅkā-* finally underwent analogical influence from the inherited nasal-infix presents of the *piṅkäṃ* type, but without being able to quote any other Tocharian example of this type than *piṅkä-*. As far as I can see, there is indeed no viable alternative to this strategy. Actually, the Tocharian roots in -*tk*, which are in fact the majority of nasal-infix presents, cannot continue inherited PIE nasal-infix presents,[12] because

---

[12] Very differently, Schmidt, 1988, 471ff.; 1989a, 308ff.; 1995, 280ff.; 2005, 557ff., who derives both allomorphs from PIE nasal present stem allomorphs, i.e., *-n-h$_2$-C > -*nā-* (Prs VI) but *-n̥-h$_2$-C > *-*än-k-* assuming a "stellungs-bedingte Konsonantisierung" of *h$_2$ into Tocharian -*k-* after *-n̥-, and he is recently followed by Kim, 2007b, 75f., fn. 22. However, there are several objections to such a sound law; see Ringe, 1996, 22; Hackstein, 2000, 99; Pinault, 2006, 103f. As for Schmidt's second example for such a development (following an etymology by Winter, 1960, 184), i.e., that the root [A]*träṅk-* 'speak' (Prs I) is based on the old nasal-infix present of [AB]*tärk^a-* 'let out, dismiss, emit' (Prs VI), apart from the phonological problem of *tr-n̥-h$_2$- > *träṅk-*, Schmidt has to assume that Tocharian both inherited a normally syllabified nasal stem PIE *tr̥-n-h$_2$- 'cross' > TA *tärnā-* from [AB]*tärk^a-* 'let out, dismiss, emit' beside oddly syllabified PIE *tr-n̥-h$_2$-, the lautgesetzlich result of which would have been preserved just in a very special meaning 'emit (a word)' (and note further that the root in TB has the meaning 'lament', which is

tk-roots are themselves reanalyzed PIE *-sk̂e/o- present stems (see chap. *tk*-Roots in detail). Note that such a metathesis is also met in *käntā-* beside analogical *kät-nā-* from *kätᵃ-* 'strew', as argued above. From the preterit stems in PT °tkā- (see for these again chap. *tk*-Roots) there could then secondarily be formed nasal-suffix presents in -*tknā-*, as per Pinault, 1989, 143; 2008, 587. After the metathesis of PT *°*tk-nā-* to °*t-ṇ-k-ā-*, e.g., *kätk-nā- > *kätänkā-, in Tocharian B these forms then could take on the athematic inflection of the one certain inherited nasal-infix present *piṅkäṃ*, as argued above, with a few relic forms still showing the *ā*-inflection as also argued above. Pace Kim, 2007b, 76, fn. 22, the *m*-Part TA *mläṅkmāṃ* (instead of expected †*mläṅkāmāṃ*) is then quite possibly not a relic form, but an analogical innovation much in the same way as TB *kutäṅkmane.* As for the synchronic nasal-suffix presents of Class VI attested instead (and in the case of *kätk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'cross' even beside) Class VII presents from roots in -*(t)k*, these can easily be explained as analogical forms. As for the members of TB present Class VII that do not belong to roots in -*tk*, it has already been stated above that inherited status seems to be certain for *piṅkäṃ* only.

---

rather an older meaning than the broader 'speak', so that one would have to assume 'emit (a lament)'). Schmidt, 1988, 477 objects to the usual assumption that the present stem TA *tärnā-* is simply due to a simplification of *tärknā- because in his opinion -*k*- is preserved in such a cluster, but he only comes up with forms with a palatal nasal for this assumption (TA *kärkñam* and TA *pärkñam*), and these Sub VII forms are in any case rather recent formations (see chap. Sub VII).

THE PRESENT OF CLASS VIII

30.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRESENT CLASS VIII

Class VIII is characterized by a thematically inflected suffix -*s*- in both languages. While the TB examples of this class consistently go back to PT *-s'ä/sæ- formations, in Tocharian A the *s*-present has fallen together with the *sk*-present in one single *s*-present stem class. However, several TA *s*-presents can be tracked back to genuine *s*-presents because of their paradigmatic affiliation with a Class VII subjunctive and/or *s*-preterit, and also on the evidence of the respective TB cognates.

The following 42 verbs form an *s*-present in Tocharian B or are more or less certain former *s*-presents in Tocharian A (41 TB, 20 TA, 19 TB = TA); furthermore five uncertain TA cognates are listed in brackets (on these see also below 30.1.1.):

ār⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. (/ᴬ*ār*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv./Kaus. II) 'leave', *er*-/ ᴬ*ar*- 'evoke', *aip*- 'cover, *käl*- (/ᴬ*käl*-) 'bear', *ku*-/ ᴬ*ku*- 'pour', *kau*-/ ᴬ*ko*- 'kill', *krāk*ʔ- 'become dirty', *krämp*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'disturb', ᴬ*kläṅk*⁽ᵃ⁾ʔ- Antigv. 'doubt', *täṅk*-/ ᴬ*täṅk*- 'hinder', *trik*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv./ ᴬ*trik*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'miss, lead astray', *nāk*-/ ᴬ*nāk*- 'blame', *näk*-/ ᴬ*näk*- act. 'destroy, lose', mid. 'fall into ruin', *näm*- act. 'bend (tr)', mid. 'bow (itr)'/ ᴬ*näm*⁽ᵃ⁾- act. 'bow (itr)', *päk*-/ ᴬ*päk*- act. 'cook (tr), let ripen', mid. 'cook (itr), ripen', *pärk*-/ ᴬ*pärk*- 'ask', *päl*- 'listen closely', *pälk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv./ ᴬ*pälk*⁽ᵃ⁾ʔ- 'burn', *pruk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'overlook, ignore', *plāk*- 'agree', *pläṅk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'sell', *plu*- 'float', *mil*- 'wound', *yāt*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv./ ᴬ*yāt*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'tame', *yärp*- 'take care', *yuk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'overcome', *yel*ʔ- '± investigate', *räk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'extend (over)', *räṅk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'ascend', *ru*-/ ᴬ*ru*- act. 'open (tr)', mid. 'open (itr)', *läṅk*- Antigv. mid. 'be attached to' (/ᴬ*läṅk*- Antigv./Kaus. II 'let dangle'), *lik*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. III act. 'wash sb.', mid. 'wash', *luk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. act./mid. 'illuminate', mid. 'light up, be illuminated' (/ᴬ*luk*- Antigv./Kaus. II 'illuminate'), *lup*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'rub, besmirch', *wāk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv./ ᴬ*wāk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. act. 'take apart', mid. 'differ', *wärk*ʔ-/ ᴬ*wärk*ʔ- 'work', *wik*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv./ ᴬ*wik*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'avoid', *ṣärp*- (/ᴬ*ṣärp*-) 'indicate', *sāk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv./ ᴬ*sāk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'remain', *tsāk*-/ ᴬ*tsāk*- 'glow', *tsäk*-/ ᴬ*tsäk*- act. 'burn (tr)', mid. 'burn (itr)', *tsäm*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'cause to grow', *tsuk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. '± suckle; foster'.

Because of an associated Pt III stem, the following TA verbs also rather had former *s*-stems:

ᴬkatw- 'ridicule' (Pt III in PPt), *ᴬkur⁽ᵃ⁾?*- Antigv./Kaus. 'make aged' (Pt III in PPt), *ᴬpäl⁽ᵃ⁾*- Antigv./Kaus. 'extinguish' (Pt III), *ᴬyärk*- 'honor' (Pt III), *ᴬrätk?*- '± raise' (Pt III).

On the other hand, the following TA *s*-stems are more or less certain former *sk*-stems, because they have a clear TB *sk*-stem cognate or because of their function as kausativum present stems:

ᴬe- 'give' (= TB Prs IXa), *ᴬeṃts⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'seize, take, understand' (= TB Prs IXa), *ᴬkātk*- Kaus. I 'make glad' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬkän*- mid. 'come about, occur' (= mid. TB Prs IXa), *ᴬkän*- Kaus. I 'fulfill (a wish)' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬkärn*- 'hit' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬkäry*- 'consider' (kaus. paradigm), *ᴬkärs⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. IV 'make know(n)' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬkäln*- Kaus. I 'let resound', *ᴬkälp⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. IV 'cause to obtain' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬtätk*- '?' (kaus. paradigm), *ᴬtäl⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. III 'lift up, raise, bear' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬtkälᵃ?*- Kaus. IV 'illuminate, illustrate', *ᴬtpuk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. ? 'hide' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬtränk*- 'cling, stick' (~ *trenk*- TB Prs IXa), *ᴬtriw⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'mix' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬtrisk*- Kaus. I 'let boom', *ᴬnätk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'hold distant, push away' (kaus. paradigm), *ᴬnärk*- 'keep away, refrain' (kaus. paradigm), *ᴬnätsw⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'let starve', *ᴬnu*- 'cry' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬnut⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'make disappear, destroy' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬpärs⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. III 'sprinkle' (kaus. paradigm), *ᴬpärsk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'frighten' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬpälk*- Kaus. I 'illuminate' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬpyāṣt⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'make grow', *ᴬpyutk*- act. 'come into being', mid. 'establish, create' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬpränk?*- Kaus. I 'reject' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬprutk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'shut, fill' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬplant⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'make glad', *ᴬmāsk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I '?', *ᴬmänk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'overcome' (= TB Sub IXb), *ᴬmi*- 'hurt' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬme*- 'gage, estimate' (TB Prs IXa), *ᴬmrosk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'make someone feel disgust' (TB Prs IXb), *ᴬyänk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'bewitch' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬyät*- 'adorn' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬyär*- Kaus. I 'bathe', *ᴬyu⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. III 'aspire' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬritw⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'connect' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬläk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. IV 'make see' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬläm⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'set' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬlut*- 'remove' (= TB IXa), *ᴬlutk⁽ᵃ⁾?*- 'make, turn into' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬlyᵃ*- '± wipe away' (= TB Prs IXa), *ᴬwārpᵃ?*- Kaus. I 'prod' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬwāsk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'stir up' (= TB Sub IXb), *ᴬwätk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. II 'command' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬwär*- 'practice' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬwär*- 'smell' (kaus. paradigm, TB *sk*-stem), *ᴬwärk?*- 'turn' (kaus. paradigm), *ᴬwik⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. II 'drive out' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬwinᵃ-s*- 'venerate, confess' (= TB *sk*-stem), *ᴬwip⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'make wet' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬwe-ñ*- Kaus. IV 'make say', *ᴬśāw*- Kaus. III 'live' (= TB Prs IXa), *ᴬṣärk*- 'surpass' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬṣi*- '± drain' (= TB Sub IXb), *ᴬsätk*- Kaus. I 'spread' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬṣtäm⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'put' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬspārtw⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'turn' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬspärk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. II 'cause to disappear' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬswär⁽ᵃ⁾?*- 'have pleasure in' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬswās⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'let rain' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬtsārw⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'comfort' (= TB Prs IXb), *ᴬtsäm⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'increase', *ᴬtsär⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'separate' (=

TB Prs IXb), *Atsälp⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'redeem' (= TB Prs IXb), *Atsit⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. IV 'make touch'. Here most likely also belong: *Amäs-* '?' (Pt II), *Atspäṅk-* 'flay' (Pt II).

	TB	TA		TB	TA
1.sg.act.	*preksau*	*läntsam*	1.sg.mid.	*pläṅsemar*	*prakäsmār*
2.sg.act.	*prekṣt*	*aräṣt*	2.sg.mid.	*prukṣtar*	*aräṣtär*
3.sg.act.	*prekṣäṃ*	*läntäṣ*	3.sg.mid.	*prukṣtär*	*aräṣtär*
1.pl.act.	*pläṅksem*	*läntsamäs*	1.pl.mid.	—	*śosamtär*
2.pl.act.	—	*wätkäś* (sic)	2.pl.mid.	*kauṣtär*	—
3.pl.act.	*preksem*	*läntseñc/* *lämtse*	3.pl.mid.	*prukseṃtär*	*arsantär*

nt-Part	*kauṣeñca*	*kämṣant*
m-Part	*kausemane*	*knäsmāṃ*
Ger/Abs	*kauṣalle*	*kämṣäl*
Inf		*knässi*

The suffix variation to be seen in the TA *nt*-participle (TA *-ṣänt-* vs. *-ṣant-*) is basically triggered by the rules of vowel balance (see chap. Prs Part 36.2.1.1.3.), while the *m*-Part variants TA *-samāṃ* and TA *-äsmāṃ* were analogically redistributed from genuine *s-* and former *sk*-stems; see chap. Prs Part 36.3. The same variation has to be assumed for the infinitive, where in most cases with roots ending in a non-syllabic we have *-ässi*, which is the generalization of the *sk*-stem allomorph, while there is merely one attestation of *-si* (TA *träṅksī* in A 343 a 5, "im Verse für *träṅkässi*", as per TG, 442); on the other hand, the occurrence of *-assi* in TA *läntassi* (once) beside TA *läntässi* (often) and in TA *nätswassi* is rather due to misspellings (which is not too unlikely in the case of *wa*, for which no fremdzeichen was available).

30.1.1. *Ambiguous TA s-presents (< old s- or sk-presents)*

The following TA *s*-stems are uncertain or ambiguous with respect to their original stem suffix, because either there is no TB cognate attested, the TB paradigm is different from the TA paradigm, both antigrundverb and kausativum subjunctive and/or preterits are attested in Tocharian A, or the TA *s*-present stem is the sole attestation of the verb:

Aākl- act. 'teach', mid. 'learn' (TB IXa 'learn', IXb 'teach'), *Aār⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv./Kaus. II 'give up, abandon' (TB has both Antigv. and Kaus. II), *Aāl⁽ᵃ⁾?-* 'keep away, hold in check' (antigv. paradigm, but TB IXb), *Aen-* 'instruct' (antigv. and kaus. paradigm), *Akäntsᵃ-s-* 'acknowledge', *Akäl-* 'bear, endure' (kaus. paradigm, but TB Prs VIII), *Aklu(s)-* 'explain' (Prs II/VIII), *Atāk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv./Kaus. I 'make to be', *Atā(-s)-/ Atäs-* Kaus. III 'provide', *Atäp-* 'proclaim' (= TB Prs IXa or b), *Aträs-*

'?', *^Atrisk-* 'sound, boom', *^Atw^ḁ-* 'burn', *^Apän-* '?', *^Apyāk-* 'strike, beat', *^Apris-* '± sprinkle' (or Prs VII), *^Amäl⁽ḁ⁾-* Antigv./Kaus. I 'repress', *^Aläṅk-* Antigv./Kaus. II 'let dangle', *^Alä-n-t-* 'go out', *^Alit⁽ḁ⁾-* Antigv./Kaus. I '± let fall down', *^Aluk-* Antigv./Kaus. II 'illuminate', *^Awärs-* 'breathe', *^Aṣärp-* 'indicate' (TA antigv. + kaus. paradigm, but TB Prs VIII), *^Asäl⁽ḁ⁾-* Antigv./Kaus. I 'throw', *^Ase-* 'support' (antigv. paradigm, but TB Prs Xa), *^Atsäk⁽ḁ⁾-* Kaus. III 'take away'.

The following cases should be noted in particular: *^Aāl⁽ḁ⁾ʔ-* 'keep away, hold in check' may have an antigrundverb paradigm in Tocharian A, and should hence possess a genuine *s*-present, but Tocharian B just has a Prs IXb; *^Aār⁽ḁ⁾-* 'leave' has a Prs VIII and a Pt IV, so it is difficult to say whether the present is an old *sk*-present belonging to the kausativum (like the preterit) or whether it belongs to the antigrundverb that is attested in Tocharian B, because the meaning 'give up' is attested for both the TB antigrundverb and the Kausativum II. The same is true for *^Akäl-* 'bear', which has a kausativum paradigm attested by the TA Pt II and also has an antigrundverb paradigm in Tocharian B. *^Aen-* 'instruct' is ambiguous, because both an antigrundverb Sub VII and a kausativum Sub IX are attested. The present of *^Aluk-* 'illuminate' may also either belong to the antigrundverb or to the kausativum. For *^Akänts^ḁ-s-* 'acknowledge', see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.6.2.3.

30.1.2. *Ablaut*

The root ablaut of *s*-presents is usually the zero grade, cf. Hackstein, 1995, 41ff., who argues that the few examples with different root ablaut show analogical influence from other stems. For the question of ablaut see also Penney, 1998, 93f., who, however, doubts that "it is in fact appropriate to be looking for a constant ablaut pattern".

30.1.3. *Function*

Hackstein, 1995, 146ff. has shown that there is no functional difference between what was labeled present Class VIIIa and present Class VIIIb by Krause (WTG) and Krause/Thomas (TEB). An *s*-present is usually formed from transitive verbs, and Hackstein, 1995, passim further pointed out that transitive roots stay transitive when forming a present of Class VIII, while intransitive roots, on the other hand, usually become transitive (on intransitive *s*-present forms see below).

In Tocharian B, the *s*-present is usually correlated with an *s*-preterit of Class III and a subjunctive of either Class I or II, beside which there may also be a subjunctive of Class III. The only exceptions with respect to the preterit class are *pruk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'overlook', which has an undoubtedly secondary *iyā*-preterit of Class VII, and *yuk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'overcome' and *lup*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'besmirch', which both have an *ā*-preterit and an *ā*-subjunctive. Accordingly, a grundverb *s*-present is normally formed from roots without A-character.

If associated with a subjunctive stem of Class III, the active *s*-present has transitive valency corresponding to a likewise active, transitive subjunctive of Class I, while the middle *s*-present has intransitive valency corresponding to that intransitive middle subjunctive of Class III, cf., e.g., *näk*- act. 'destroy, lose', mid. 'fall into ruin, disappear'. This type is discussed in detail in chap. Valency 4.7.2.

As in the case of *näk*-, the intransitivity of a middle *s*-present form such as *länksentär* 'they are attached to' from *länk*- 'hang' is also due to the middle voice in anticausative function, and the isolated intransitive TB middle *s*-present forms *wākṣtär* from *wāk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. mid. 'differ' and *sakṣtär* (MQ) from *sāk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. mid. 'remain, restrain oneself' should be explained in a similar way (note that Tocharian A has the expected active, transitive counterparts).

Intransitive *luksentär* 'they light up' from *luk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'light up; illuminate' has been explained in a similar fashion, cf. Hackstein, 1995, 124, but the *s*-present of that root is also a special case: as is usual, it has an intransitive grundverb 'light up' with A-character (III/V/I) and a transitive antigrundverb paradigm (VIII/II/III). What is remarkable is that there is also at least one example of a transitive middle *s*-present *lukṣtar* conveying a special attachment of the subject (see chap. Voice 5.2.3.). This is, in fact, one of the very few examples where middle voice can have both anticausative function and another middle function within the same stem formation.

A problematic *s*-present stem with respect to valency comes from the antigrundverb of *trik*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'err, etc.', because in this case we have active *s*-present forms with both transitive and intransitive valency. To be sure, this is also true for the corresponding subjunctive stem, so that the unusual valency behavior is not a special problem of the present stem; see the discussion of the root in chap. Valency 4.5.1.1.1.

If there is no second paradigm attested from a root forming a present of Class VIII, the pattern Prs VIII/ Sub I-II/Pt III is also nearly always confined precisely to transitive verbs. The sole exception is the intransitive activum tantum *plu*- 'float, fly, soar' (VIII/I/III). In all

other cases of intransitive *s*-presents from mono-paradigmatic roots we are dealing with media tantum, where it is again most likely that it is the middle voice that caused the intransitive valency.

Finally, *plāk-* (itr) (a/a/m) (VIII/I/III) is an unusual verb, because it is one of the few intransitive verbs with both active and middle voice, and although there is a difference in meaning to be observed between active and middle, there is no similar change of valency between them: act. 'agree (with)', 'receive agreement', mid. 'ask for permission'.

In Tocharian A, with respect to function the picture is, of course, obscured by the merger of *s*-presents and former *sk*-presents. To be sure, all certain old *s*-presents show the same pattern that is found in Tocharian B. Most TA *s*-present forms are transitive; intransitive use is only found with middle forms (cf. again the medium tantum intransitive *ᴬtsāk-* 'glow').

30.2. Diachronic Treatment

The derivation of the Toch. *s*-present is a highly debated issue, and the main reason for this fact is that the reconstruction of a PIE present class with zero-grade root ablaut and a suffix *-se/o- is very uncertain.[1] See the detailed discussion by Hackstein, 1995, 159ff., who points out that the flaw of most older theories was that they concentrated on the suffix and less on the likewise important features root ablaut, accent, and function.

Lane, 1953, 489 proposed a derivation of the class from PIE *-sk̂e/o-presents both in iterative ("intransitive") and factitive ("transitive") function, the suffix *-se/o- being due to simplification in roots ending in *-k: *-k-sk- > -k-s- (similarly, Klingenschmitt, 1982, 62). Watkins, 1962, 63 claimed that IE forms such as Ved. *ukṣati* 'besprinkle' : Gk. ὑγρός 'wet', Av. *taxšaiti* 'make run' : *tačaiti* 'run' that immediately come to mind as possible cognates of the Toch. *s*-present are "essentially nonce creations". He takes *nekse/o- as a radical thematic present from a root with root-final *-s* on the evidence of Lat. *noxa* 'damage' (which he compares to the pattern Lat. *toga* 'toga' : *tegō*

---

[1] Note that Celtiberian had a zero-grade thematic *s*-subjunctive, which is, however, interpreted as an innovation; see Schumacher, 2004, 224 and K. H. Schmidt, most recently 2007, 319.

'cover'), beside which there is also an *s*-aorist *nek-s-,[2] and this then may have been the nucleus of the class. Kortlandt, 1984 = 2007, 68 derives Class VIII from a thematization of formerly athematic *s*-subjunctives also to be seen, according to him, in Latin, Celtic, and Baltic. He does not discuss the ablaut, but claims that the former athematic inflection is still preserved in the athematic subjunctive of Class I, which is usually paired with Class VIII and the *s*-preterit, and which should have lost the -*s*- "between two obstruents". According to Jasanoff, 1987, 101f.; 1988, 58 the present Class VIII directly continues the PIE *s*-aorist subjunctive. In favor of such an assumption he uses the argument that an *s*-present is usually correlated with an *s*-preterit, which is "difficult to account for save by assuming a formal link between the two sigmatic categories" (1987, 101). He further points out that there is no corresponding *s*-subjunctive class in Tocharian, which could precisely be explained by the fact that the PIE *s*-aorist optative was also asigmatic, so that no *s*-subjunctive in Tocharian would indeed be expected. As for the transitive function of the *s*-present, Jasanoff, 1987, 102, fn. 23 compares the same function of the sigmatic aorist (at least in Greek), a connection that "requires further study". Jasanoff's view is followed by Rasmussen, 2002, 380, who explains the unexpected zero grade of the Tocharian Class VIII analogically. Adams, 1994, 4f. has the following objections to Jasanoff's explanation: the Prs VIII has zero grade in the root, not the expected *e*-grade; it is the PIE present that usually turns into a Tocharian subjunctive stem, while the respective Tocharian present stem is a more complex formation, so that one would not expect a PIE subjunctive to have been directly turned into a present stem formation. The only PIE subjunctive Adams accepts as being directly reflected in Tocharian is the Sub II of *käm-* 'come'; but see chap. Sub II 19.2. Adams himself would prefer to derive the Prs VIII class from a "*se/o*-iterative-intensive, as is usually supposed, parallel to the -*sḱe/o*-iterative-intensives." As for the connection with the *s*-preterit, Adams states that the *se/o*-present stems were chosen because "their *-*s*- was phonologically reminiscent of the *-*s*- of the preterit, not because of any morphological identity".[3]

---

[2] Actually, there is no need to set up an *s*-extended root *neks- on the evidence of Lat. *noxa*, because that abstract could easily be based on an *s*-stem.

[3] The idea by Levet, 1991, 170ff. that the *s*-present is to be derived from a nominal formation, i.e., an agent noun, lacks any likelihood.

The most detailed treatment of the origin of the Tocharian *s*-present is the one by Hackstein, 1995, passim. As for possible Tocharian continuants of PIE *s*-stems, Hackstein merely accepts *auks-/ ^Aoks-* 'grow, increase' as a possible candidate for such an inherited *se/o*-present stem, and this verb forms precisely a present stem of Class XI, and not of Class VIII.

As for the general origin of the Tocharian *s*-present, Hackstein did not give a detailed solution. He pointed out the close relationship between the Tocharian *s*-present and the Tocharian *s*-preterit; he further follows the view of Ringe, 1990, 216 that the pattern of transitive *s*-preterits beside intransitive root preterits may be derived from a pattern of *s*-aorists standing beside root aorists, so that the function of forming transitives is reminiscent of the same function of the *s*-preterit, even though he thinks this was not a PIE state of affairs, but an innovation that independently took place in Tocharian and in Greek. Hackstein comes to the following conclusion (p. 165): "Trotz der funktionalen Affinität der *s*-Morpheme im tocharischen Präsens VIII und Prt. III bleibt eine historische Verbindung beider spekulativ. Es müßte ein Modell bemüht werden, nach dem durch einfache Thematisierung aus dem urtocharischen *s*-Suffix von Prt. III ein präsentisches *se/o*-Suffix gewonnen wurde". Melchert, 2000a, 145f. (with ref. to Kuiper, 1934) criticizes that "Hackstein [1995] too readily dismisses the possibility that they [i.e., the *s*-presents] are developed from a PIE class of athematic *s*-presents".

To sum up, there are more arguments in favor of the assumption that the *s*-present is indeed a completely inner-Tocharian formation based on the *s*-preterit. It is simply a fact that there are not too many possible candidates for membership in such a PIE *s*-present class at all, and Hackstein has shown that no convincing relation of any of the Tocharian *s*-presents with any IE *s*-stem formation can be adduced at all. Further, PIE present stem formations are usually continued by a Tocharian subjunctive stem, while Tocharian present stems either show the same stem formation as the correlated subjunctive stem (and this is the unusual, relic pattern), or more commonly are inner-Tocharian creations and almost always more complex than the corresponding subjunctive stem.[4] Finally, a similar (although not completely identical) pattern of Prs(/Sub) and Pt stem is found in the

---

[4] Note that according to Peters, forthc., even the active paradigms of the *s*-presents were based on pre-PT 3.sg. *middle* forms of root aorists that had an ending *-se, which, according to him, had been a variant of a middle ending *-e.

case of thematically inflected *sk*-stems beside *ṣṣā*-preterits and thematically inflected *ññ*-stems beside *ññā*-preterits.

A possible counterargument that could be brought forth against the assumption of the *s*-present being based on the *s*-preterit is the fact that the *s*-preterit undoubtedly must have had a prop vowel between any stem-final non-syllabic and the -*s*- (PT *præk-äsā > *preksa*, see chap. Pt III 9.1.1.), whereas the *s*-present does not show any trace of such a prop vowel.[5]

---

[5] Note that the absence of a prop vowel *ä in front of the present suffix -*s*- is also quite remarkable with regard to the fact that such a prop vowel can again be found in front of the suffix of what are suffixial *sk*-formations and at least in one subclass of the nasal stems of Class VI.

THE PRESENT AND SUBJUNCTIVE OF CLASS IX

31.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRESENT AND SUBJUNCTIVE CLASS IX

Since in Tocharian B an *sk*-subjunctive stem of Class IXa and Class IXb is usually associated with a similar present stem formation of Class IXa or IXb, it is fitting to discuss both present and subjunctive classes together. In Tocharian A, the *s-* and *sk*-presents fell together in one single class in *-s-*. Nevertheless, in the following chart former *sk*-presents of Tocharian A are listed whenever such a stem can be set up on the basis of its paradigmatic affiliation in Tocharian A itself or because of the TB cognate.

31.1.1. *Present Class TB IXa and subjunctive Class TB IXa and TA IX*

The following 39 verbs form a Class IXa present, i.e., an *sk*-stem without initial accent in Tocharian B, and six of them also show a similar subjunctive stem of Class IXa (nine have a more or less clear TA cognate):

ākl- 'learn' (/*^Aākl-* act. 'teach', mid. 'learn'), *ān⁽ᵃ⁾-sk-* 'inhale' (= Sub IXa), *ār⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II (= Sub IXa; also Prs IXb), *ārt(t)⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. III 'acknowledge', *ārsk-* 'give up', *āl^ä-sk-* 'be sick' (= Sub IXa), *ās-* 'bring', *eṅk-* 'seize'/ ~ *^Aemts⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'instruct', *ai-/ ^Ae-* 'give, take', *kätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cross', *kän⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'come about'/ *^Akän-* mid. 'come about, occur', *kärk^ʔ-* 'bind', *kärś-* 'chop up', *käln-* Kaus. III 'howl, roar', *kälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'obtain', *kälm-* '± enable', *kälyp-* 'steal', *treṅk-/ ^Aträṅk-* 'cling, stick', *tw^ä-/ twās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'shine', *nusk-* 'squeeze', *pārāk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'make prosper', *mai-/ ^Ame-* 'gage, estimate' (TB = Sub IXa), *mlut^ä-* '± pluck', *yām-* 'do', *yāsk-* 'beg', *lāl-* 'exert oneself', *läk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'see', *liy⁽ᵃ⁾ʔ-/ ^Aly^ä-* '± wipe away', *lut-/ ^Alut-* 'remove', *wämp^ʔ-* '?', *wäs-* 'don, wear', *wäs-* 'dwell', *win^ä-sk-/ ^Awin^ä-s-* 'venerate, confess' (TB = Sub IXa), *we-ñ-* 'speak', *śāw-* Kaus. III/ *^Aśāw-* Kaus. III 'live', *sāt^ä-sk-* 'exhale' (= Sub IXa), *sāmp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'take away', *spālk^äʔ-* '± strive for', *tsärk-* 'heat'.

Unclear TB stems are: *āks^ä-* 'waken' (Prs IXa or IXb), *kärtk^ʔ-* '± decay' (Prs IXa or IXb), *tin^ä-* '± defile oneself' (Prs IXa or IXb), *räs-* '± remind' (Prs IXa or IXb), *re(-sk)-* 'flow' (Prs II/IX), *yätk^äʔ-* '?' (Prs IXa or IXb), *yaukk^ä-* 'use' (Prs IXa or IXb), *wip-* 'shake' (Prs IXa or IXb), *wlā(-sk)-* '± give off, waft' (Prs II/IX), *ṣärtt^ʔ-* 'incite' (Prs IXa or IXb).

The seeming Prs IXa/Sub IXa forms of *musk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. II 'make subside' (3.sg. *muskaṣṣäṃ*) and *wätk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. II 'command' (Abstr I *wätkāṣṣälyñe*, etc.) may rather belong to Prs/Sub IXb; see below 31.1.4.2. For a list of unclear or ambiguous TA *s*-stems that may go back to former *sk*-stems (= TB IXa or TB IXb) or to simple *s*-stems, see chap. Prs VIII 30.1.1. On *ār*⁽ᵃ⁾- with IXa beside IXb forms, see below 31.2. fn. 29.

31.1.1.1. *TB subjunctive Class IXa*

In Tocharian B, a subjunctive of Class IXa is attested with certainty almost exclusively for disyllabic roots in -*sk*- (on the special case of *ār*⁽ᵃ⁾-, see below 31.2. fn. 29):

ān⁽ᵃ⁾-*sk*- 'inhale', *āl*ᵃ-*sk*- 'be sick', *mai*- 'gage, estimate', *win*ᵃ-*sk*- act. 'venerate, honor', mid. 'confess', *sāt*ᵃ-*sk*- 'exhale', *stin*ᵃ-*sk*- 'be silent'; probably also *śän*ᵃ-*sk*- '?', but see the discussion s.v. *śä(-nāsk)*- '?'.

All other forms analyzed by the manuals as TB *sk*-subjunctive stems without initial accent, i.e., what is called Class IXa by TEB, actually belong to what TEB called Class IXb, i.e., they have initial accent; see below 31.1.4.2.

31.1.1.2. *TA subjunctive Class IX*

The TA Class IX subjunctive is characterized by a suffix TA -*āṣ*-/-*ās*-, so that it differs from its TB equivalent by consistently showing a long -*ā*- before the former *sk*-suffix, while in the respective present class the two languages basically just differ with respect to the outcome of the *sk*-suffix. A TA Class IX subjunctive is attested from the following 39 roots:

ᴬ*eṃts*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. III/IV '?', ᴬ*en*- 'instruct', ᴬ*kän*- Kaus. I 'fulfill (a wish)', ᴬ*kärn*- 'hit', ᴬ*käry*- 'consider', ᴬ*käln*- Kaus. I 'let resound', ᴬ*kliṣ*ᵃ- Kaus. I 'make sleep', ᴬ*täkw*ᵃ- Kaus. ? '?', ᴬ*täm*- Kaus. I 'beget, generate', ᴬ*näm*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'bow', ᴬ*närk*- 'keep away, refrain', ᴬ*nätsw*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'let starve', ᴬ*nut*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'make disappear, destroy', ᴬ*pälk*- Kaus. I 'illuminate, show', ᴬ*pis*- 'play (a musical instrument), blow', ᴬ*pyutk*- act. 'come into being', mid. 'establish', ᴬ*prutk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'shut; fill', ᴬ*mi*- 'hurt, harm', ᴬ*lutk*⁽ᵃ⁾?- 'make, turn into', ᴬ*yät*- 'adorn', ᴬ*yär*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'bathe', ᴬ*yu*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. III 'aspire to, reach out for', ᴬ*ritw*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'connect, translate; create', ᴬ*läm*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'set; make sit down', ᴬ*lut*- Kaus. IV 'let remove', ᴬ*wārp*ᵃ?- Kaus. I 'prod, urge', ᴬ*wätk*⁽ᵃ⁾- Antigv. 'separate; decide; answer', ᴬ*wär*- 'practice', ᴬ*wik*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. II 'drive out, remove', ᴬ*win*ᵃ-*s*- 'honor, venerate', ᴬ*ṣärtw*- 'incite', ᴬ*ṣärp*- 'indicate, explain, instruct', ᴬ*sälp*ᵃ- Kaus. I 'make glow', ᴬ*ṣtäm*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'put, place', ᴬ*spārtw*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'turn', ᴬ*spärk*⁽ᵃ⁾-

Kaus. II 'cause to disappear, destroy', ^{A}*tsäm*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. I 'increase, cause to grow', ^{A}*tsälp*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. I 'redeem, free', ^{A}*tsuw*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. I 'put together'.

1.sg.act.	*wikāsam*	1.sg.mid.	*pyutkāsmār*
2.sg.act.	—	2.sg.mid.	—
3.sg.act.	*wikāṣ*	3.sg.mid.	*pyutkāṣtär*
1.pl.act.	—	1.pl.mid.	—
2.pl.act.	—	2.pl.mid.	—
3.pl.act.	*wätkāseñc*	3.pl.mid.	*lmāsaṃntär*
Ger	*wikāṣäl*		
Abstr	*wikāṣlune*		

A subjunctive of Class IX is mostly attested from roots with non-full root vowel. Note that in the few forms from roots with a full root vowel weakening by vowel balance takes place, cf. the 3.sg. Opt TA *entsṣiṣ* from ^{A}*eṃts*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. III/IV '?', Abstr TA *enāṣlune* from *en-* 'instruct', TA *wārpäṣlune* from ^{A}*warp*$^{ä?}$- Kaus. I 'prod', TA *spārtwäṣlune* from ^{A}*spārtw*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. I 'turn'. A Sub IX is usually paradigmatically associated with an *s*-present of Class VIII that goes back to a former *sk*-present (with the sole exception of ^{A}*täm-* 'beget', which has a Prs X), and with a preterit of Class II (mostly) or IV (or both), depending on the root vocalism.

A TA Class IX subjunctive functions as subjunctive stem of a kausativum and is thus the equivalent of a TB Class IXb subjunctive with initial accent.

31.1.2.   *Present and subjunctive Class TB IXb and TA cognates*

The following 120 roots form a present and/or subjunctive of Class IXb in Tocharian B, i.e., have initial accent; corresponding former TA *sk*-presents that can be set up due to their paradigmatic affiliation or TB cognate are also listed here (101 TB, 61 TA, 42 TB = TA):

ākl- Kaus. IV 'teach', *ān*$^{(a)}$*-sk-* Kaus. I 'let breathe', *ār*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. II (also Prs/Sub IXa) (/ ^{A}*ār*$^{(a)}$- Antigv./Kaus. II) 'give up, abandon', *āl*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. II 'hold in check', *ās*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. II 'make dry', *en-* 'instruct' (= Sub IXb)/ (^{A}*en-*), *aiw*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. II 'turn to', *kātk-* Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ^{A}*kātk-* Kaus. I 'make glad', *kārp*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. I 'make descend' (= Sub IXb), *kätk*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. IV 'let pass, cross' (= Sub IXb), *kän*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. I/ ^{A}*kän-* Kaus. I 'fulfill (a wish)', *kärn*$^?$- Kaus. III 'inflict pain'/ ^{A}*kärn-* 'hit', ^{A}*käry-* 'consider', *kärs*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. IV (= Sub IXb)/ ^{A}*kärs*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. IV 'make know(n)', ^{A}*käln-* Kaus. I 'let resound', *kälp*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. IV/ ^{A}*kälp*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. IV 'cause to obtain', *käs-* Kaus. IV 'let come to extinction', *kuk-* '± tire, exhaust' (only Sub IXb), *kery-* Kaus. I 'make laugh', *krās*$^{(a)}$- Kaus. III act. 'vex', mid. 'be

angry', *klāw*^(a)- Kaus. I 'name' (= Sub IXb), *klutk*^(a)- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*lutk*^(a)?- 'make, turn into', *klautk*^(a)- Kaus. I 'make turn' (= Sub IXb), ^A*tätk*- '?', *tämts*- '?' (= Sub IXb), *täl*^(a)- Kaus. III (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*täl*^(a)- Kaus. III 'lift up, raise, carry', *tuk*^(a)- Kaus. I/ ^A*tpuk*^(a)- Kaus. ? 'hide', ^A*tkäl*^ᵃ?- Kaus. IV 'illuminate, illustrate', *trik*^(a)- Kaus. II 'lead astray', *triw*^(a)- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*triw*^(a)- Kaus. I 'mix', ^A*trisk*- Kaus. I 'let boom', *twās*^(a)- Kaus. I 'kindle' (only Sub IXb), *nān*^(a)- Kaus. I 'show' (only Sub IXb), *nāsk*- Kaus. I 'bathe', ^A*nätk*^(a)- 'hold distant, push away', *närk*- (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*närk*- 'keep away, refrain', ^A*nätsw*^(a)- Kaus. I 'let starve', *närs*- 'urge', *nitt*^(a)- Kaus. I 'tear down', *nu*^(a)- Kaus. III/ ^A*nu*- 'cry', *naut*^(a)- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*nut*^(a)- Kaus. I 'make disappear, destroy', ^A*pärs*^(a)- Kaus. III 'sprinkle', *pärsk*^(a)-/ ^A*pärsk*^(a)- Kaus. I 'frighten', *pälk*-/ ^A*pälk*- Kaus. I 'illuminate', *pält*?- 'drip', *putk*^(a)- Kaus. III 'divide', ^A*pyāṣt*^(a)- Kaus. I 'make grow', *pyutk*- (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*pyutk*- act. 'come into being', mid. 'establish, create', *prām*?- '± restrain' (only Sub IXb), *pränk*^(a)- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*pränk*?- Kaus. I 'reject', *prutk*^(a)- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*prutk*^(a)- Kaus. I 'shut; fill', ^A*plant*^(a)- Kaus. I 'make glad', *plu*- Kaus. I 'let soar' (only Sub IXb), ^A*māsk*^(a)- Kaus. I '?', *mäk*- Kaus. I 'make run' (only Sub IXb), *mänk*^(a)- Kaus. I (only Sub IXb)/ ^A*mänk*^(a)- Kaus. I 'overcome', *märk*- '± besmirch', *märs*^(a)- Kaus. IV 'make forget', *mälk*^(a)- Kaus. III '± cross (arms)' (?), *mäsk*- '(ex)change' (= Sub IXb), *mi*- (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*mi*- 'hurt', *mit*^(a)- Kaus. I 'let go' (= Sub IXb), *miw*^(a)- Kaus. I 'shake', *musk*^(a)- Kaus. II 'make subside', *mauk*^(a)- Kaus. I '?', *mrausk*^(a)- Kaus. I/ ^A*mrosk*^(a)- Kaus. I 'make someone feel disgust', *yänk*^(a)- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*yänk*^(a)- Kaus. I 'bewitch', *yāt*^(a)- Kaus. II 'enable, tame' (= Sub IXb), *yās*^(a)- Kaus. I 'excite', *yät*^(a)- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*yät*- 'adorn', *yäp*- Kaus. I 'let enter', ^A*yär*^(a)- Kaus. I 'bathe', *yäs*- Kaus. III 'touch (sexually)', *yu*- (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*yu*^(a)- Kaus. III 'aspire', *rām*^(a)- Kaus. IV 'let compare', *räsk*- '± spice', *ritt*^(a)- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*ritw*^(a)- Kaus. I 'connect', *lāl*- Kaus. I '± make tired', *läk*^(a)- Kaus. IV (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*läk*^(a)- Kaus. IV 'make see', *länk*- Kaus. II 'let dangle' (/^A*länk*- Antigv./Kaus. II 'let dangle'), *lä-n-t*- Kaus. I 'let go out', *läm*^(a)- Kaus. I/ ^A*läm*^(a)- Kaus. I 'set, let subside', *litk*^(a)?- 'remove', *wāk*^(a)- Kaus. II 'let bloom', *wārw*^ᵃ?- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*wārp*^ᵃ?- Kaus. I 'prod', *wāsk*^(a)- Kaus. I 'move away' (only Sub IXb)/ ^A*wāsk*^(a)- Kaus. I 'stir up', *wäks*^(a)- Kaus. I '± make turn away', *wätk*^(a)- Kaus. II (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*wätk*^(a)- Kaus. II 'command', *wär*- (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*wär*- 'practice', ^A*wär*- 'smell', ^A*wärk*?- 'turn', *wi*- 'frighten', *wik*^(a)- Kaus. II (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*wik*^(a)- Kaus. II 'drive out', ^A*wip*^(a)- Kaus. I 'make wet', ^A*we-ñ*- Kaus. IV 'make say', *waiw*^(a)- Kaus. I 'moisten', *śänm*- 'bind' (= Sub IXb), *ṣärk*-/ ^A*ṣärk*- 'surpass', *ṣi*- (only Sub IXb)/ ^A*ṣi*- '± drain', *sāk*^(a)- Kaus. II 'restrain, leave behind' (= Sub IXb), *sätk*^(a)- Kaus. II/ ^A*sätk*^(a)- Kaus. I 'spread', *särk*- Kaus. IV '± let take care of', *säl*^(a)- Kaus. II 'throw' (= Sub IXb)/ (^A*säl*^(a)- Antigv./Kaus. I 'throw'), *suk*?- Kaus. I 'let linger', *sum*- '± trickle', *soy*- Kaus. I 'satiate' (= Sub IXb), *stäm*^(a)- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*ṣtäm*^(a)- Kaus. I 'put', *staukk*^(a)- Kaus. I 'make swell', *spārtt*^(a)- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*spārtw*^(a)- Kaus. I 'turn', *spänt*^(a)- Kaus. I 'make trust', *spärk*^(a)- Kaus. II (= Sub IXb)/ ^A*spärk*^(a)- Kaus. II 'cause to

disappear', *swār*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I/ ᴬ*swār*⁽ᵃ⁾ᵃ⁾²- 'enjoy', *swās*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ᴬ*swās*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'let rain', *tsārw*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ᴬ*tsārw*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'comfort', ᴬ*tspäṅk*- 'flay', ᴬ*tsäm*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'increase', *tsär*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ᴬ*tsär*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'separate', *tsälp*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I (= Sub IXb)/ ᴬ*tsälp*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'redeem', ᴬ*tsit*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. IV 'make touch', *tsuw*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'add'.

Unclear TB stems are: *āks*ᵃ-'waken' (Prs IXa or IXb), *kärtk*²- '± decay' (Prs IXa or IXb), *täp*-/ ᴬ*täp*- 'proclaim', *tin*ᵃ- '± defile oneself' (Prs IXa or IXb), *räs*- '± remind' (Prs IXa or IXb), *yätk*ᵃ²- '?' (Prs IXa or IXb), *yaukk*ᵃ- 'use' (Prs IXa or IXb), *wip*- 'shake' (Prs IXa or IXb), *ṣärtt*²- 'incite' (Prs IXa or IXb).

For a list of unclear or ambiguous TA *s*-stems that may go back to former *sk*-stems (= TB IXa or TB IXb) or to simple *s*-stems, see chap. Prs VIII 30.1.1.

	TB Prs IXa		TB Prs IXb
	A-character	Non-A-character	
1.sg.act.	*kälpāskau*	*yamaskau*	*watkäskau*
2.sg.act.	*kälpāst*	*yamast-ne*	*watkäst*
3.sg.act.	*kälpāṣṣäṃ*	*yamaṣṣäṃ*	*watkäṣṣäṃ*
1.pl.act.	*kälwāskem*	*aiskem*	*ānäskem*
2.pl.act.	*kälwāścer*	*aiścer*	*watkäścer-ñ*
3.pl.act.	*kälpāskeṃ*	*yamaskeṃ*	*swāsāskeṃ*
1.sg.mid.	*winaskemar* (MQ)	*yamaskemar*	*tūkäskemar*
2.sg.mid.	*lkāstar*	*yamastar*	*maukästār* (MQ)
3.sg.mid.	*kälpāstär*	*yamastär*	*tukästär*
1.pl.mid.	—	*yamaskemtär*	*ānäskemtär*
2.pl.mid.	—	*arttastär*	—
3.pl.mid.	*kälpāskeṃtär*	*yamaskentär*	*tukäskentär*
3.du.act.	—	*westeṃ*	—
nt-Part	*kälwāṣṣeñca*	*yamaṣṣeñca*	*swāsäṣṣeñca*
m-Part	*kälpāskemane*[1]	*yamaskemane*	*swāsäskemane*
Ger/Abs	*kälpāṣle*	*yamaṣṣälle*	*watkäṣle*

31.1.3.   *The merger of s- and sk-stems in Tocharian A*

The merger of former *sk*-presents with former *s*-presents in Tocharian A was not due to a sound law by which *-sk- turned into TA -*s*-, but rather the result of various analogical processes. Especially since the palatalized result of both suffixes turned out mostly to be a simple TA -*ṣ(-)*, the two stem formations were finally blended into one; see Adams, 1988a, 76; Ringe, 1989a, 42, fn. 7; Winter, 1994a, 290f. = 2005,

---

[1] The *m*-Part *enäṣṣemāne* in the MQ text H 149.291 a 4 (archaic ductus) showing the wrong suffix allomorph can only be a writing error.

471f.; Hackstein, 1995, 209f. It has to be pointed out that some forms with surfacing TA *-äṣ-* or TA *-äs-* must stem from what had been formerly the *-sk- paradigm. Note that the lexicalized relic form of an *m*-Part TA *tāskmāṃ* 'resembling' has preserved TA *-sk-*, which, however, must here be due to some kind of hypercorrection, thereby attesting to a prehistorical free variation *-s-/-sk- in such forms.[2] The irregular gemination of the stem-final consonant before the *nt*-suffix in TA *swāṣṣantāṃ* from ᴬ*swās*⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. I 'let rain' may likewise show the lautgesetzlich outcome of *-s'k'-. Finally, the regularly attested gemination in the 3.sg.act. ending variant TA *-äṣṣ-* occurring before clitics such as in 3.sg. TA *lutkäṣṣ-äṃ* may just be another reflex by sound law of former *-s'k'-.

31.1.4. *A-character vs. loss of A-character*

In Tocharian B, roots with A-character usually lose it when forming an *sk*-present/subjunctive of Class IXb. This is also true in Tocharian A for any kind of synchronic *s*-presents. The TA subjunctives of Class IX, however, as a rule show the suffix TA *-ās-/ -āṣ-*, i.e., what looks like a generalization of the shape of *sk*-formations made from roots with A-character (the suffix is affected by vowel balance). The general rule for Tocharian B is that A-character in Class IXb stems is lost, while non-kausativum Class IXa stems keep A-character (cf. Hackstein, 1995, 33f.). However, there are exceptions in both directions.

31.1.4.1. *Preservation and loss of A-character in TB Class IXa stems*

It is not surprising that A-character roots that form an *sk*-present as the normal present stem of the grundverb keep A-character in this present as well.[3] This is true for: *āks*ᵃ- 'waken' (itr) (-/a/a) (IX/V/I), *kätk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'cross', 'pass' (tr/itr) (x/x/a) (VI-VII-IX/V/I), *kälp*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'obtain' (tr) (x/a/a) (IX/VI/I), *mlut*ᵃ- '± pluck' (?) (—) (IX/V/-), *läk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'see, look' (tr) (x/x/x) (IX-V/V/I).

---

[2] Hackstein, 1995, 187ff. assumed that the form belonged to an *ā*-stem TA *tāskā-*, but it may be more economical to assume that TA *tāsk-* 'resemble', in fact, goes back to the same stem as Prs II TA *tās-* = TB *tās-*, since 'resemble' is indeed a meaning the TB stem still has in the middle (in passive function).

[3] But note that an *s*-present always makes lose A-character, cf. the cases of *yuk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'overcome' and *lup*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'besmirch'.

The same preservation of -*ā*- is also regularly found with disyllabic roots ending in -*āsk*-. To be sure, when a kausativum is formed from such a disyllabic root, the -*ā*- before -*sk*- is again replaced by -*ä*- (as per Schmidt, 1982, 367), cf., e.g., *ān⁽ᵃ⁾-sk*- 'breathe in': Gv. *anāṣṣäṃ* 'breathes in' vs. Kaus. I *ānäskem* 'we make breathe in'. Here belong: *ān⁽ᵃ⁾-sk*- 'breathe in' (itr) (x/-/-) (IX/IX/-), *ālʸ-sk*- 'be sick' (itr) (a+/-/-) (IX/IX/-), *winʸ-sk*- 'venerate, honor; confess' (tr) (x/a/a) (IX/IX/IV), *sātʸ-sk*- 'exhale' (itr) (a+/-/-) (IX/IX/-). The only clear example from Tocharian A is ᴬ*winʸ-s*- being the cognate of *winʸ-sk*-.

On the other hand, in some TB IXa present stems we nevertheless find -*ä*- instead of the expected (*)-*ā*-. Such is the case with *sāmp⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'take away, deprive' (tr) (m/-/m) (IX/V/I) (3.sg.mid. *sompastär*, etc). That ⟨sompa°⟩ indeed renders /sompä́°/ and not /sómpā°/ is proven by the MQ-character form 3.pl. Prs *sompäskentär* in St. 42.2.3 a 1 (a text with archaic ductus; see Malzahn, 2007a, 268). In the case of *ārt(t)⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. III 'acknowledge; rejoice in' (tr) (m/-/-) (IX/-/-), with the exception of the non-initial accent we seem to have to do with a kausativum paradigm: 1.sg.mid. *artaskemar*, etc. Note that the not so rarely attested present forms of *ārt(t)⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. III are confined to the middle, which is also true for the whole paradigm from *sāmp⁽ᵃ⁾*- and for the next example: Prs IXa 3.sg. *twasastär* /twāsä́stär/ from *twās⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'shine' (itr) (m/-/-) (IX/-/I), which seems to be a back-formation from the kausativum (cf. Inf *twāsässi*). For *āl⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. II (+Antigv.) 'hold in check' that I take to be basically a Class IXb stem rather than a Class IXa stem, see immediately below. Probably *yaukkʸ*- 'use' (tr) (m/m/m) (IX/V/I) (3.sg.mid. *yaukkastär*) also belongs here.[4]

31.1.4.2. *Preservation and loss of A-character in TB Class IXb stems*

The two characteristics of the TB Class IXb presents and subjunctives are initial accent and loss of A-character when the root had A-character in the grundverb. However, there are numerous forms from what certainly are Class IXb stems which show stem-final -*ăṣṣ*-/-*ăsk*- instead of expected -*äṣṣ*-/-*äsk*-.[5] I doubt that all these examples can

---

[4] If the once attested *yaukkastär* (M) is not an error for †*yaukkāstär*, another possibility is analysis as a Prs IXb form with preservation of A-character, for which see below 31.1.4.2.

[5] As already noticed by Krause (WTG, 87, § 89,2): "Nur wenige Verba zeigen in ihren Kausativformen den Mittelvokal -*a*- (mit normaler Vokalschwächung in der Wurzelsilbe)". Krause's examples were: *artaskemar*,

simply be dismissed as misspellings. Since some of these forms are attested side by side with the expected Class IXb forms (especially in the Weber manuscript or in the MQ manuscript 322), it seems to me that we rather have to do with genuine linguistic variation. The examples are:

2.sg. Sub *enastar-c* (KVāc 17 b 3) from *en-* 'instruct'; 3.sg.mid. Prs *kārpastär* (323, 3, MQ) from *kārp*[(a)]- Kaus. I 'make descend'; 3.sg. Prs *kanaṣäṃ-nne* (PK NS 48 a 1, non-MQ) from *kän*[(a)]- Kaus. I 'fulfill';[6] Ger I *śarsaṣṣäle* (KVāc 19 a 5) from *kärs*[(a)]- Kaus. IV 'make know(n)'; Inf *klāwastsi* (214 a 3, MQ) from *klāw*[(a)]- Kaus. I 'name'; 3.sg. Prs *klutkāṣn* (572 frg. 1 b 7, MQ) and *klutkaṣṣäṃ* (THT 1859 a 3, MQ, archaic ductus) from *klutk*[(a)]- Kaus. I 'turn into'; 3.sg. Opt *tälaṣṣi* (407 b 1, MQ) from *täl*[(a)]- Kaus. III 'lift'; 3.sg. Prs *trīwaṣṣäṃ* (336 a 3, MQ) [beside Ger *(tr)īwaṣälle* in line a 5 in the same text], *m*-Part *triwaskemane* (322 b 5, MQ) [beside *triwäskemane* in b 3 in the same text], Ger *triwaṣle* [beside *triwäṣle* in the Weber manuscript] from *triw*[(a)]- Kaus. I 'mix'; Inf *nautastsi* (281 a 5, MQ) from *naut*[(a)]- Kaus. I 'make disappear'; 1.sg. Prs *prutkaskau* (93 b 4, Š), 3.sg. Prs *prutkaṣṣäṃ* (non-MQ in H 149.19 a 6 and MQ in THT 1859 b 4; archaic ductus), and 3.sg. Opt *prutkaṣṣi* (THT 1314 a 5, MQ, archaic ductus) from *prutk*[(a)]- Kaus. I 'shut; fill' [beside many regular Prs IXb forms]; 3.sg. Prs *mīyaṣṣäṃ* (THT 1314 a 5, MQ, archaic ductus), *nt*-Part *(mi)yaṣṣeña* (522 b 3, Š), and Abstr *miyaṣlñe* (48 a 1 Š, 591 a 2 S) from *mi-* 'hurt'; 3.sg. Opt *yātaṣṣi* (310 a 5, Š) from *yāt*[(a)]- Kaus. II 'enable'; 1.sg. Prs *rittaske͡u* (PK AS 12F a 2, MQ, archaic ductus) and *nt*-Part *rittaṣṣeñca* (K 5 b 1, non-MQ) from *ritt*[(a)]- Kaus. I 'connect'; *m*-Part *laṅkaskemane* (322 a 4, MQ) [beside

---

etc. [a Prs IXa stem in my opinion]; *naittaṣṣäṃ* [I cannot find any attestation of such a form]; *prutkaskau*, etc. [see below in the main text]; *muskaṣṣäṃ* [see below in the main text]; *śawaṣṣäṃ* [a Prs IXa stem in my opinion]; *spārtaṣṣäṃ*, etc. [see below in the main text]; *tsärkaṣṣäṃ*, etc. [a Prs IXa stem in my opinion]; *āklaṣṣeñca* [I cannot find any attestation of such a form, and the stem is a Prs IXa stem in my opinion in any case]; *tsälpaṣṣimar* [an MQ form, see below in the main text]. Since Krause himself did not offer an explanation for this phenomenon and in the immediately following sentence mentions the common "Vertauschung von -*a*- und -*ä*-" in MQ texts (also discussed with examples precisely from IXb forms in §§ 1,1,b and 1,2; see below fn. 8), the existence of such forms has not gained any attention in the scholarly discussion yet.

6 Whether *k[an] ////* in 81 b 1 can be restored to a 2.pl.act. Prs/Sub IX *k[an](aścer)* with a similar stem allomorph *kānā-* remains uncertain.

länkäskemane (MQ) in line a 5 in the same text] from *länk-* Kaus. II 'let dangle'; 3.sg. Sub *watkaṣäṃ* (H 149.37 b 5, MQ),[7] 3.sg. Prs/Sub *wätkāṣäṃ* (IOL Toch 157, MQ, cf. Peyrot, 2008, 230), 3.sg. Opt *watkaṣṣi* (H 149.X.4 a 5, non-MQ) from *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II 'command'; Inf *wīkastsi* (147, 5, MQ) from *wik⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II 'remove'; 3.sg. Opt *śänmaṣṣi* (THT 1314 a 5, MQ, archaic ductus) from *śänm-* 'bind'; 2.sg. Prs *soyast* (PK AS 17I a 5, non-MQ) and Inf *soyasi* (554 b 2, MQ) from *soy-* Kaus. I 'satiate'; the Kaus. I of *spārtt⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'turn' actually shows three stem allomorphs: *spārttäsk-* (in the MQ form Ger I *spārttäṣälya*), *spārttāsk-* (*spārttaṣṣäṃ* in 200 b 1 [M], 3.pl. Prs *spārttaskeṃ* in K 2 a 4 [DA], and Inf *spārtassi* in S 4 a 2 [non-MQ]), and *ṣpārttāsk-* (3.sg. Prs *ṣparttaṣṣäṃ* in 30 b 8 [Š], 1.sg. Opt *ṣpartaṣṣim* in PK NS 32 a 2 [non-MQ]); Inf *ṣpärkastsi* (343 a 4, MQ, still slightly archaic ductus) from Kaus. II *spärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cause to disappear' [note that the Ger I *ṣpärkaṣṣälle* is attested even more often than regular Ger I *sparkäṣṣälle*, notably in the Weber manuscript, but also in 505 = SHT 3, 902, h (non-MQ character)]; 1.sg.mid. Opt *tsälpaṣṣimar* (228 a 1, MQ, still slightly archaic ductus) and Inf *tsälpastsī* (224 b 3, MQ, archaic ductus) from *tsälp⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'redeem'; Ger I *tsuwaṣälle* [found beside *tsuwäṣälle* in the Weber manuscript] from *tsuw⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'add'.

On the other hand, the Šorčuq form 3.pl. Prs *läntäskeṃ-ne* is rather due to copying from an MQ text; in the case of *ṣarttastär* from *ṣärtt⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'incite', it is unclear whether the form belongs to a Prs IXb or IXa.

In general, *-ăsk-* and *-ăṣṣ-* instead of regular *-äsk-/-äṣṣ-* is more often attested in non-finite forms and quite often in MQ texts, some of which show archaic ductus. Note that the same phenomenon is to be observed in (the far less frequent) Class Xb (e.g., 3.sg.mid. Opt *tanmaṣṣitär*). The writing of ⟨a⟩ and ⟨ā⟩ in the suffix in texts with MQ character cannot just be dismissed as a rendering of /ä/, because it is precisely the mark of MQ-character texts that they can render every kind of /ä/ as ⟨ä⟩ (i.e., also accented /ä́/) (cf. Peyrot, 2008, 31ff.), and do not render unaccented /ä/ by ⟨ă⟩. Therefore, a spelling ⟨a⟩ in an MQ text most certainly renders either /ä́/ or /ā/.[8] What these forms show is accordingly most probably a preservation of the stem-final *-ā-*,

---

[7] Pace WTG, 288, the same damaged form *(wa)t(kä)ṣṣäṃ* can be restored in b 3 of the same text; see Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 7.

[8] The majority of examples given by WTG, 2, § 1,1,b for writing "*a* für [unaccented] *ä*" are exactly provided by such Class IXb present stem forms. For his other examples, none of which are compelling, see Malzahn, in print c.

which, from a diachronic point of view, is to be expected in the first place.

With respect to this claim, note that the majority of cases from non-MQ texts clearly show accent on the root, e.g., *kanaṣäṃ-nne* from *kän⁽ᵃ⁾-*, *śarsaṣṣäle* from *kärs⁽ᵃ⁾-*, *watkaṣṣi* from *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-*, etc. However, there are two such instances which at a first glance seem to show the accent on the suffix: Abstr I *wätkāṣṣälyñe* from *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II 'command' and Ger I *ṣpärkaṣṣälle* from *ṣpärk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II 'cause to disappear'.

As for *wätkāṣṣälyñe* 'command' in the Šorčuq text 251, even though it comes from a central find spot it has some archaic-looking writings and is accordingly classified as "IB" by Stumpf and "archaic II" by Peyrot, 2008, 195 and 220.[9] Hence, *wätkāṣṣälyñe* is also rather an MQ form and cannot tell us anything about the accent. The same may also be assumed for the Ger I *ṣpärkaṣṣälle* that is found two times in the Weber manuscript, and in addition in the classical/standard medical texts M 1 b 4 and 505 b 2. Although this form is attested four times (whereas expected *ṣparkä-* is found only three times: in *ṣparkäṣäle* KVāc 16 a 4, in *ṣparkäṣṣälñe*, and *ṣparkäṣṣukiṃ*), it is not arbitrary to assume that we have to do with copies from MQ texts in all four instances, because precisely medical texts (like the Weber mss.) seem to have been among the earliest written documents in Tocharian in the first place (cf. Malzahn, 2007a, 274).

Since it has become clear that genuine Class IXb forms can show preservation of A-character, the form *muskaṣṣäṃ* from *musk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II 'make subside', which comes from the Weber manuscript like many of the IXb forms with ⟨-ask-⟩, ⟨-aṣ-⟩ mentioned above, should also be analyzed as a Class IXb stem formation.[10] On the other hand, the respective Sub II made from this root should be assigned to an antigrundverb paradigm. I would then also propose to take the present forms in *-sk-* from *āl⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II(/+Antigv.) 'hold in check', which are found beside a Sub I and a Pt III, to be basically Prs IXb forms, i.e., with the MQ form *aläṣṣeñca* showing regular loss of A-

---

[9] For remains of MQ-character texts from the central region, see Malzahn, 2007a, 287ff.

[10] As was, to be sure, already done by Krause (WTG, 87, § 89,2).

character, and the MQ form *alaṣṣälle* and the 3.sg.mid. *(ā)l(astär)* from KVāc[11] showing preservation of A-character.[12]

31.1.5. *The vowel (*)-ä- in (*)-ä-sk/ṣṣ-*

The suffix allomorph of *sk*-stems both from roots that lost and roots that never had A-character is (*)-*äsk-/-äṣṣ-*. One may guess that a prop vowel *-ä- had first been inserted by sound law between a restricted number of root-final non-syllabics and the suffix PT *-sk/s'k'-, for which kind of anaptyxis one can point to *ṣkaste* 'sixth' < PT *s'äkästæ < *s'äkstæ < pre-PT *sekstos (see Pinault, 1989, 61; Ringe, 1996, 71f.), and that *-ä- was later generalized. On the other hand, it is obvious that in certain contexts, this generalized *-ä- could later (in pre-TB times) be deleted by sound law again, see below 31.1.6.2.1. *sk*-presents from roots ending in *-s* like *wäs-* 'don' (3.pl.mid. *yäskemtär*) lack the prop vowel due to an early loss of *ä between identical consonants.[13] On the other hand, the 3.sg. *wsaṣṣäṃ* from *wäs-* 'dwell' owes its preservation of (*)-*ä-* to analogy.

31.1.5.1. *Loss of that (*)-ä- and loss of the root vowel*

In metrical passages that (*)-*ä-* may be lost before the palatalized suffix allomorph *-ṣṣ-* and sometimes even before the non-palatalized allomorph *-sk-* (cf. Thomas, 1979, 173ff.). Note the following clear examples: Prs IXb *nt*-Part *kanṣeñca* (Š) from *kän(a)-* Kaus. I 'fulfill'; Sub IXb Ger *mitṣle* (Š) from *mit(a)-* Kaus. I 'let go'; Prs IXb *nt*-Part *nautṣṣeñca* attested twice in text 30 (Š) from *naut(a)-* Kaus. I 'make disappear'; Prs IXb *nt*-Part *soyṣṣeñca* from *soy-* Kaus. I 'satiate'; Prs IXb 3.sg. *stamṣäṃ* (Š) beside *stamäṣṣäṃ* and Sub IXb 3.pl. Opt *stamṣyeṃ* beside *stamäṣyeṃ* from *stäm(a)-* Kaus. I 'put'; Sub IXb Abstr *spārtṣlñe* from *spārtt(a)-* Kaus. I 'make turn'.

---

[11] An *sk*-form from this root can be restored with some certainty in KVāc 17 a 3, as per Schmidt, 1986, 49, who, however, preferred a Prs IXa form *(a)l(astär)*; see also next footnote.

[12] Differently, Schmidt, 1975, 292 argued that a Prs IXa made from this root supports the analysis of the subjunctive stem as Class IV, but see my objections to that claim in chap. Sub IV 21.1.1.

[13] Note that Winter apud Hackstein, 1995, 268 rather opted for analyzing the present stem *yäsk-* from *wäs-* 'put on' as a simple thematic present of Class II, but see the objection by Hackstein, l.c.

All of these examples come from Prs IXb or Sub IXb stems, i.e., are forms with initial accent, so that the syncopated *ä did not bear the accent in the first place, and hence these cases are different from cases such as *kätkre* from *käktare* showing metrical loss of what seems accented *ä́. The only stem in suffixal -*sk*- showing loss of what seems a formerly accented *ä́ is the *sk*-present of *yäm*- 'do'; see the collection of forms in Thomas, 1979, 174. The Prs IXa of *yäm*- is also the only such stem to provide an example for loss of *ä in front of the *sk*-allomorph in the 3.pl. *yämskeṃ-ne* and 1.pl.mid. *yämskemntär*, which, interestingly enough, are both attested in eastern texts. The same situation is found in the Class IV preterit, where, on the one hand, we have metrical loss of usually unaccented *ä in front of -*ṣṣ*-, while the only examples for a syncope of accented *ä́ in the Class IV preterit come again from *yäm*-; for the spelling of these syncopated forms, see chap. Pt IV 10.1.2.3.

As for the reason why an unaccented and even an accented *ä can be syncopated in what seems a closed syllable, one has to assume that the geminate -*ṣṣ*- was simplified to -*ṣ*- so that the *ä came to stand in an open syllable and was then deleted regularly. Simplification of geminates is, of course, an informal-style feature, so that one may expect the syncopated forms to be attested in such texts. However, in contrast to the prediction, syncope in *sk*-present/subjunctive stems seems to be confined to *metrical* texts. Although Thomas, 1979, 178, fn. 149 states that metrical syncope of *ä can sometimes also be seen "in Prosatexten", he gives no such examples from *sk*-presents/subjunctives[14] nor from the similarly structured *ṣṣā*-preterit.[15]

<hr/>

[14] The 3.sg. Prs *yätṣäṃ* attested in the prose text 201 a 3 (M) may be a Class VIII form and not a syncopated Prs IXb form (see s.v. *yät(a)*- 'be capable'), because an antigrundverb stem (beside the kausativum) is also attested by the Pt III *yätwa* and in Tocharian A. To be sure, one cannot totally exclude that *yätṣäṃ* is a syncopated Prs IX form, the more since the form is attested in a text from Murtuq and could accordingly be an informal-style form.

[15] Other word classes indeed show the loss of what seems a formerly accented *ä́ in open syllables even in literary prose texts, cf. the collection of examples in Thomas, 1979, 150. If this phenomenon was indeed due to an informal-style development, one would at least expect that these prose texts overwhelmingly come from eastern sites. Unfortunately, only two examples come from texts of certain provenance: *räskre* in 113 indeed hails from the eastern find spot Sängim, while *cäñcreṃ* in 522 hails from Šorčuq. Note that the syncope to be seen in °*wäntre* acting as second member of compound is

Nevertheless, at least two such syncopated Class IV preterit forms are attested in prose texts, and one of them comes from an informal text, so this may indeed indicate that we are dealing with an informal-style phenomenon that was used as a metrical device. Note that Thomas, 1979, 180f. has shown that a similar loss of unaccented *ä before the usually geminated gerundive suffix *-lle* is likewise not confined to metrical passages but also is "der Umgangssprache nicht fremd". In this case, we certainly have a degemination *-ll-* > *-l-* similar to *-ṣṣ-* > *-ṣ-* leading to an open syllable and then again regular syncope of unaccented *ä standing in an open syllable.[16]

Winter, 1977, 142, = 1984, 187 = 2005, 179 also brought forth examples of what seems to be loss of an accented root vowel *á in Class IXb formations: the 3.sg.mid. Prs IXb *tpästär* from *täp-* 'proclaim' that is attested twice (once in a metrical passage in an MQ text and once in a non-MQ prose text); however, even though one would expect a Prs IXb for structural reasons (the form stands beside a Pt IV), a Prs IXa stem is not excluded. Winter also cites *knasta(r)* "you cause to materialize" from *kän⁽ᵃ⁾-* as a second form of this kind, but this is not a IXb form, cf. Hackstein, 1995, 231 and s.v. *kän⁽ᵃ⁾-*. As for his third example, i.e., the lexicalized *nt*-participle *īpäṣṣeñca* 'pātayantika' from the kausativum of *yäp-* 'enter', Winter no doubt correctly states that the loss of the root vowel has to be an archaism because of the form being detached from the verbal paradigm.[17] Note further that beside the regular Ger *yapäṣṣällona* (192 a 4, MQ), there is also a Ger *īpäṣṣälle* attested in the (small) Abhidharma fragment 180 a 5. However, this gerundive may have formed just another terminus technicus together with neighboring *avidyä* 'ignorance' (< Skt. *avidyā*) and hence, just like *īpäṣṣeñca*, may have been detached from the

---

not an example of the kind of syncope that concerns us here, because in this case the syncopated *ä did not bear the accent, cf. Thomas, 1979, 153.

[16] The status as informal-style feature becomes also evident by a comparison of the parallel prose Prātimokṣa texts PK NS 58 and 336 (MQ), for which cf. Pinault, 1994, 152. PK NS 58 has *yamaṣle* and *triwäṣle* where more archaic 336 has *yamäṣälle* and *trīwaṣälle*; at the same time, PK has the Inf form *śwätsiśco* and the pronoun *se* where 336 has *śwätsiscä* and * k̭use*; on *se* being an informal variant of *k̭use*, see Stumpf, 1990, 68 and Peyrot, 2008, 71f; on the preservation of final *-ä*, see Malzahn, 2007a, 282ff. Interestingly enough, in more archaic 336 one nevertheless also finds simplified *-ṣṣ-* in *weṣäṃ* where PK has *weṣṣäṃ* 'says'.

[17] Note that even though the vowel *ä* is lost, the accent seems not to have been shifted onto the suffix (not †*īpaṣṣeñca*).

verbal paradigm, whereas the regularly shaped gerundive *yapäṣṣällona* 192 a 4 still seems to act as a verbal adjective: *ñake śak wi āyatanta yel{ṣ}allona pīś āntseṃne yapäṣṣällona* "Now the twelve states (of sensation) are to be investigated (?) and they are to be entered in the five Skandhas" (cf. the Dutch translation by Couvreur, 1954c, 113).

31.1.6.   *The five sk-present/subjunctive stem formations*

There are basically five different groups of *sk*-formations:
(1) old monosyllabic *sk*-roots (*pāsk*-/ [A]*pās*-) and similarly *tk*-roots (see chap. *tk*-Roots in detail);
(2) suffixal *sk*-stem formations (trisyllabic *sk*-stems in the terminology by Hackstein, 1995) with normal accent in Tocharian B (Prs IXa, and TA Prs VIII);
(3) suffixal *sk*-stem formations with initial accent in Tocharian B (Prs/Sub IXb, TA Prs VIII/Sub IX);
(4) disyllabic roots in *-āsk*- with preservation of *-ā*- (*wināsk*-/ TA *winās*-);
(5) monosyllabic *sk*-stems from former suffixal *sk*-stems in *-äsk*- with complete loss of the vowel *-ä*- (disyllabic *sk*-stems in the terminology by Hackstein, 1995); see below 31.1.6.2.1.[18]

31.1.6.1.   *Different behavior of radical -sk- and suffixal -s- and -sk-*

In Tocharian B, the outcome of pre-PT *-s(k)eT- in Class VIII presents and the Class II presents/subjunctives from old monosyllabic *sk*-roots is *-ṣt*- as in *lupṣtär*, *yäṣtär*, whereas its result in the other *sk*-present/subjunctive stem formations is *-st*- as in *kälpāstär* and *rinastär* (with the exception of *kätkāṣtär* attested in a graffito, which maybe merely shows the same development (*)-*st*- > -*ṣt*- that is found in

---

[18] It has to be stressed that owed to our limited knowledge of the Tocharian material, it is often hard or impossible at present time to assign a given TB stem in *-sk*- to one of those five different groups of *-sk*-formations as kept distinct above — e.g., one cannot rule out that beside (*)*ānāsk*- 'breathe', there still existed some forms from unextended *āna*- in historical times; Hartmann, 2001, 104ff. with fn. 34 was far too unskeptical in this respect. Note further that the kausativum from this root shows the usual loss of A-character, which is a fact that may point to a synchronic analysis of (*)*ānāsk*- as suffixal *sk*-stem made from a root *āna*- indeed (i.e., as belonging to group (2) rather than to group (4)).

Tocharian A); see WTG, 76, § 81,2; Marggraf, 1970, 18ff.; Winter, 1993, 202f. = 2005, 446f.; Hackstein, 1995, 206f.; 2001, 34. This divergence is evidently due to a difference with respect to stem structure — whereas in the former two classes the stem consisted of only one syllable,[19] in the latter four classes the stem consisted at least of two syllables in PT times, which is a fact that could have triggered different accentuation schemes, but maybe the difference in the results was merely caused by that very difference in the number of syllables alone. To be sure, Winter, l.c. rather assumed that a difference in accentuation caused the different behavior with respect to palatalization: according to him, loss of accented *-á- led to palatal -ṣ-, but loss of non-accented *-ä- led to non-palatalized -s-. Somewhat differently, Ringe, 2003, 360f. claimed that loss of non-accented *ä had occurred before palatalization for the reason that depalatalization *ṣt > st would have been unlikely for phonological reasons. Another explanation is proposed by Pinault, 1989, 140. According to him, a sequence -ṣṣä- < *-sk̂e- was quite generally depalatalized before a dental (-st-), but not so *-ṣä- < *-se-. His further suggestion is then that on the model of palatalized -ṣt- found in the present Class VIII, the roots ending in -sk finally replaced lautgesetzlich -st- analogically by palatalized -ṣt-, but it is not easy to see why sk-roots should have chosen the s-present as a model rather then the other sk-presents.

The following different schemes of accent and palatalization can be set up:

Prs/Sub II	*pās'k'-ä-tär	*pāṣtär*	TA *pāṣtär*
Prs VIII	*läwp-s'-á-tär	*lupṣtär*	TA *āläṣtär*
Prs IXa	*yām-á-s'k'ä-tär	*yamastär*	TA *träṅkäṣtär*
Prs IXb	*lám-ā/ä-s'k'ä-tär	*lamästär*	TA *kātkäṣtär*
anāsk type	*ān-á-s'k'ä-tär	*anāstär*	—
aisk type	*āy-ä-s'k'ä-tär	*aistär**	TA *eṣtär**

---

[19] As for the monosyllabic shape of the present stems of Class VIII, it is indeed remarkable that in this present class no *ä had developed between any root-final non-syllabic and the suffixal -s-, in contrast to what had happened in the whole paradigm of Pt III; see chap. Prs VIII 30.2. As it seems, a prop vowel developed only immediately in front of what was taken for an *ending* on the one hand, and within difficult consonant clusters on the other hand.

(Due to the *pātär* rule — on which see chap. Sound Laws 1.3. — the original accentuation of **pās'k'-ä-* and **āy-ä-* must remain unclear.) Note that in Tocharian A, every sequence **st* is turned into *ṣt* by sound law.

31.1.6.2.   *Remarkable stems in (*)-äsk-*

31.1.6.2.1.   The type *aisk-*

Hackstein, 1995, 207 lists the following "disyllabic" *sk*-stems: *aisk-* 'give', *resk-* 'flow', *yäsk-* 'put on, don', *wärsk-* 'smell', *wesk-* 'speak'. However, from *resk-* and *yäsk-* diagnostic forms with *-st-* are missing. On the other hand, one has to add *maisk-* '± gage, estimate' to this group.[20]

Although stems of the *aisk-* type are monosyllabic on the surface, they differ from old monosyllabic roots in *-sk* in two ways: first, a root variant without *sk*-extension is still attested in Tocharian (which is another feature that does not apply to *resk-*), and second, they show *-st-* as outcome of pre-PT **-skeT-* and not *-ṣt-* as the Class II presents/subjunctives from roots in *-sk-* do. The obvious conclusion will be that *aisk-*, etc. had started out as disyllabic PT **āyäsk-*, etc.; in the case of *wärsk-* 'smell', the initial accent as found in *warskemane*, etc. provides additional proof for the former presence of an **-ä-*; for the loss of that **-ä-* between a glide or a sonorant and *-sk-*, see W. Winter apud Hackstein, 1995, 205, fn. 3 and Ringe, 1989a, 37.

31.1.6.2.2.   *wärsk-*

The stem allomorph *wärsk-* from *wär⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'smell' shows the *sk*-variant in the present, subjunctive, and preterit, and hence this stem is similar to the *anāsk-* type and not to the *aisk-* type. However, *wärsk-* is also different from *anāsk-* inasmuch as the preterit stem goes back to PT **wärskā-* and the present stem to PT **wäräsk-*. Hackstein, 1995, 256ff. analyzes this stem as Prs IXa on the evidence of the preterit stem *wärskā-*. This preterit stem is synchronically irregular, because simple thematic subjunctive/present stems from roots with root-final *-sk* that form an *ā*-preterit show a palatalized stem-final in the preterit (*pāsk-* type), and so do, in fact, suffixal *sk*-present stems, because the preterit Class IV in *-ṣṣā-* associated with such *sk*-presents/subjunctives is nothing else but a palatalized variant of *-sk-ā-*. Such Pt IV forms are also found with disyllabic *sk*-roots of the type *wināsk-*. *wärsk-* is

---

[20] I do not see how *lyyask-* '± wipe away' fits here.

exceptional, because it has a non-palatalized finite preterit. A second such example comes from the stem allomorph *ārsk-* from *ār⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II 'give up', which has an irregularly unpalatalized PPt *ārskoṣ*; but note that *arskaṣṣ-*, *arṣṣī-* can only go back to PT **ārsk-* and not to **āräsk-*.

31.1.6.2.3.   *twasastär*

The root *twᵃ̄-* 'shine' has a root variant *twās⁽ᵃ⁾-*. A similar variation is shown by *s(u)wᵃ̄-/ swās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'rain'. Basically, we are dealing here with roots in *-ā-* (*)*twā-* and *s(u)wā-* that have been extended by a suffix *-sā-* in most stems of the paradigms (for the source of the *sā*-extension, see Peters, 2006, 336, fn. 17).[21] The intransitive grundverb Prs IXa 3.sg.mid. *twasastär*, which may be a substitute of an old present stem (*)*twā-*, can be explained as back-formation based on the kausativum Prs/Sub IXb *twā́sä-*. As for the root *liy⁽ᵃ⁾?-/ ᴬlyā-*, which is sometimes compared with these two roots, its behavior is indeed somewhat similar in Tocharian A,[22] but note that its alleged preterit *lyyāsa* is neither a preterit form nor any other form from this root at all.

	TB	TA	TB	TA
Prs	*s(u)wā-*	*swä-*	*twāsä-*	—
Sub	*swāsā-*	*swāsā-*	—	*twāsā-*
Pt	*swāsā-*	*swāsā-*	—	**twāsā-*
PPt	—	—	(*twoṣ*)[23]	*tātwsu < *tātwāsāwä*
A&Kaus	*swāsä-*	*swāsä-*	*twāsä-*	*tusä-*

31.1.7.   *Palatalization of the root initial*

Root-initial palatalization is found in the following *sk*-present or subjunctive forms:

kätk⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. IV 'let pass' (Prs IXb: *śatkäṣṣeñca*); *kärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. IV (Prs/Sub IXb: *śarsäskau*, etc.)/ *ᴬkärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. IV 'make know(n)' (Prs VIII < *sk*-Prs: TA *śärsäṣt*, etc.); *plu-* Kaus. I 'let fly, soar' (Sub IXb: *plyustsi*); *litk⁽ᵃ⁾?-* 'remove' (Prs IXb: *lyitkäṣṣi*, etc.); *ᴬlutk⁽ᵃ⁾?-* 'turn into' (Sub IX: TA *lyutkäṣiṣ*); *säl⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. II 'throw' (Prs/Sub IXb: *ṣaläṣṣäṃ*,

---

[21] On the other hand, *ᴬkäntsᵃ̄-s-* 'acknowledge' hardly belongs here; see s.v. *ᴬkäntsᵃ̄-s-*.

[22] Winter, 1965, 208 = 2005, 124 cites *liy⁽ᵃ⁾?-/ᴬly⁽ᵃ⁾-* and *su-/swā-* 'rain' as parallel examples for *s*-extensions, but without detailed discussion.

[23] The form is philologically uncertain.

etc.); *suk�*- Kaus. I 'let linger' (Prs IXb: *ṣūkäskeṃ*); *spārtt⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'turn' (Prs/Sub IXb: *sparttaṣṣäṃ* beside *sparttaṣṣäṃ* and *spartaṣṣim* beside *spārtassi*); *spänt⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'make trust' (Prs IXb: *ṣpantäṣäṃ*, etc.); *spärk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. II (Prs/Sub IXb: *ṣparkäṣṣäṃ*, etc.)/ ᴬ*spärk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. II 'cause to disappear' (Sub IX: *ṣpärkāṣlune*).

Note also the Prs IXa variant *ñuskaṣṣäṃ* beside *nuskaṣṣäṃ*: the root *nusk*- 'squeeze' has unexpected root-initial palatalization in the Sub II (*ñuṣṣalñe*) and in the Pt III and respective PPt as well. A variation between *ly°* and *l°* is also attested with the Prs IXa of *lut*- 'remove'. *spārtt⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I 'turn' is a special case, because the Prs/Sub IXb shows three different stem allomorphs: *spārttäsk*- (usual formation), *spārttāsk*- (preservation of A-character), and *ṣpärttāsk*- (old *ā*- stem on which the *sk*-formation was based in the first place, also still to be seen in the Priv *eṣpirtacce* 'unturned'; see below 31.2.).

Winter, 1980b, 555ff. = 1984, 247ff. = 2005, 242ff. claims that there is a pattern to be found for presents/subjunctives of Class IXb with palatal vs. non-palatalized root initial and their respective preterits of the grundverb: if the preterit has a non-full root vowel with a palatalized initial, the palatal present stem Class IXb is always associated with a grundverb preterit that has likewise a palatalized root initial; the roots in question are further claimed to be characterized by being transitive and having a nasal present in the grundverb. However, a recheck of the material shows that there is no complementary distribution between root-initial palatalization in the kausativum and what I call Subclass 1 *ā*-preterits (and respective nasal presents). Winter himself has to admit that out of his eleven examples of palatalized kausativa already two violate the prediction. On the other hand, I do not see why such a pattern should just be true for roots containing the root vowel -*ä*- but not for a root like *litk⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'avert' as well. The Inf *pirsässi* cited by Winter is not an example at all, because the form has to be read otherwise (see s.v. *pärsᵃ*- 'sprinkle'). The complicated paradigm of *säl⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'fly, arise' is a special problem; see the detailed discussion in Malzahn, in print a. Winter, 1980b, 555 = 1984, 247 = 2005, 242 in addition claimed that palatalized *ṣärk*- 'surpass' (IXb/-/II) is the kausativum of *särk⁽ᵃ⁾*- (< "steigen lassen"), but it is not certain whether these forms are indeed related, and there is no preterit attested from *särk*- at all. The palatalized Prs/Sub IXb allomorph *sparttaṣṣäṃ* from *spārtt⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'turn' is a further counter-example, because the grundverb is intransitive and has no palatalized *ā*-preterit. There is no grundverb preterit attested from *ṣūkäskeṃ*

either, and it is unclear whether the single attestation of the grundverb
is transitive at all. There is also no grundverb preterit attested from
śänm- 'bind', because the root only has a kausativum paradigm. The
only good example for the alleged pattern is furnished by *kärs⁽ᵃ⁾-*
'know'. On the other hand, there are a lot more kausativa without
palatalization in the present/subjunctive Class IXb made from roots
with a palatalizable root initial that do have a palatalized *ā*-preterit in
the grundverb, and all of them, according to Winter, are characterized
by having the meaning "± eine Bewegung ausführen". But this
meaning is also true for *kätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cross'. In short, I do not see any
morphological pattern with palatalized vs. non-palatalized Prs/Sub IX
forms. There is no distributional pattern with respect to TB varieties,
and note further that there are some TA/TB equations among the
forms with initial palatal. What can be said is that the forms with
palatal are in the minority, and that all examples of palatalized
Prs/Sub IX forms have a preterit of Class II beside them. Based on this
fact one may at first toy with the idea that palatalization may have
precisely spread from the palatalized preterit Class II stem, but we
will see in the diachronic section below (31.2.) that the forms with
palatalization must actually be the more archaic ones.

31.1.8.   *Function*

In Tocharian B, the Class IXb presents and subjunctives with initial
accent belong to kausativum paradigms, even though in some cases a
respective grundverb is unattested (like for *en-* 'instruct'). All four
kinds of kausativa are found, i.e., even Kaus. III stems that show the
same valency as the grundverb. Accordingly, Class IXb stems are
usually transitive. The only exceptions are: *krās⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. III, which
shows voice alternation tr. act. 'vex', itr. mid. 'be angry'; *pyutk-* itr. act.
'come into being', tr. mid. 'create' (on this special kind of voice
alternation, see chap. Voice 5.2.2.1.), and *yu-* 'seek, aspire, turn
towards', which has a complicated history; see s.v. *yu-*. On the other
hand, three Kaus. III paradigms have a present of Class IXa, i.e., an *sk*-
stem without initial accent: *ārt(t)⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'love', Kaus. III 'acknowledge',
käln- 'resound', Kaus. III 'howl, roar (of the wind)', and the intransitive
śāw-/ ᴬśāw- 'live', Kaus. III 'live'.[24] While the *sk*-present forms of

---

[24] The Ger I *śāwäṣṣälle* from the standard TB text 43 a 3 with seemingly
initial accent is without much context and may therefore be a true Prs IXb
form ('let live') if the form is not due to copying from an MQ text.

ārt(t)⁽ᵃ⁾- Kaus. III have non-initial accent, they also lack A-character (*käln-* 'resound' and *ᴬᴮśāw-* 'live', of course, never have A-character in the first place). All other Class IXa *sk-*present stems are normal grundverb stems associated with subjunctive and preterit stems not typical of kausativa, i.e., they serve as normal present stem formation for transitive and intransitive roots alike.

In Tocharian A, the formal cognate of Sub IXb is Sub IX, and these stems are likewise either part of a kausativum paradigm or at least associated with typical kausativum stems.

31.2. DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

In Tocharian the inherited PIE *-sk̂-* morpheme could not only be attached to roots, but to present (and possibly preterit) stems as well, like in other IE languages, most notably Hittite, Greek, and Latin. Clear evidence comes from present stems such as TB *śawask-* 'live' and TB *lkāsk-* 'see', which at the same time show that in Tocharian itself, adding *-sk-* did not trigger any essential change with respect to semantics in general, or valency in particular.[25] The obvious conclusion to be drawn from this fact is that the causatives/ oppositional transitives of Class IX (mostly IXb) are to be explained as enlargements in *-sk-* of older stems formally lacking *-sk-* but already equipped with a causative/oppositional transitive meaning. This strategy has already been adopted by some scholars such as Hilmarsson (1991, 54ff.), Eyþórsson (1993, 67; 1997, 245f.), and Kim (2004, 222ff., esp. 225, with fn. 75) with only Hilmarsson pointing out that such older causative/oppositional transitive stems without *-sk-* are actually still attested by the imperatives of Class II and by some privative formations. These two categories indeed presuppose the former existence of causative/transitive formations devoid of *-sk-*, ending in PT *-ā-* (of mostly suffixal origin), and having as a root vowel pre-PT *e > PT *'ä at least in the active.[26] With regard to reduplication, the imperatives and privatives in question must have

---

[25] See the discussion by Hackstein, 1995, 3 (and passim), who no doubt is perfectly right in claiming that "kausative Funktion nicht zu den urtocharisch ererbten Funktionen des Suffixes gehörte".

[26] As a matter of fact, the middle imperative TB *karsar*, which belongs to the causative paradigm, clearly shows that the respective middles originally rather had the zero grade of the root. Note that only the two privative formations *atraikatte** and *ayāttate** do not fit the pattern described above.

lacked reduplication, but this could have been due to secondary dereduplication, a process also met frequently, e.g., in Ancient Greek, where reduplicated verbal forms tended to lose their reduplication syllables after preverbs. Note in addition that the stem *iyā-* 'go; lead' with suffixal *-ā-* acted as its own causative without being suffixed by *-sk-*, so that one may be tempted to assume that causative function may have rather had to do with the presence of suffix PT *-ā-/ -å̄-.

As for the initial accent seen in Class IXb, there can be no doubt that initial accent[27] and concomitant substitution of stem-final PT (*)-ā- by *-ä-* were finally perceived as devices for forming causative/ oppositional transitive presents in *-sk-*, as becomes obvious from the pair *anāsk-* 'breathe'/ *ānäsk-* Kaus. I 'let breathe'; at least for this pair, the former existence of two different (pre-)PT proto-forms can be safely ruled out.[28] Of course, this initial accent calls for a diachronic explanation, and both the fact that Kaus. I *parākäsk-* lacks true initial accent and the fact that some members of IXb are Kausativa III, i.e., not what any linguist would call causatives at all, clearly show that originally neither initial accent itself nor the diachronic reasons for that initial accent could have had anything to do with causativity/ oppositional transitivity.

As far as I can see, only the former presence of a reduplication syllable standing in front of a root syllable with a root vowel other than pre-PT *ä, *i, or *u is apt to explain the initial accent of what must have been the prototypical members of Class IXb. As shown by Kim, 2003, 225, fn. 75, preforms of the βιβρώσκω type, i.e., preforms such as Very Early pre-PT *ti/e-tl̥h₂-sk̂e/o-, would simply not work with respect to phonology, because resulting pre-PT *tätäl(ä)sk- should have turned into PT *täl(ä)sk-, which then should not have borne initial accent in TB times at all. As was argued above, and has been amply shown by Hilmarsson, 1991, 48ff., we rather have to start with causative/oppositional transitive present stems (and also some other present stems not involved in valency change at all) that in general had a root vowel pre-PT *e > PT *'ä in the active and ended in (mostly suffixal) PT *-ā-. In addition, we now have to say that the prototypical cases among those former present stems devoid of *-sk-* must also

---

[27] Or maybe rather: accent on the root syllable, to judge from Kaus. I *parākäsk-* 'make prosper', which by definition nevertheless belongs formally to Class IXa.

[28] See again Hackstein, 1995, 3 (who follows Winter, 1980, 440 here; see also Winter, 1980b, 555 = 1984, 247 = 2005, 242).

either have been reduplicated right from the start, or acquired reduplication secondarily at some stage in (pre-)PT times.[29]

Hilmarsson's detailed, but often-neglected respective argument is, of course, worth a closer look: in his pioneering 1991 study on privatives, Hilmarsson was basically concerned with showing that there are at least five examples of privatives derived from what seemed "causative" Class V *ā*-subjunctives, i.e., Class V subjunctives functioning as subjunctive stems of a kausativum paradigm, and he assumed that these "causative" *ā*-stems reflect an older strategy of forming kausativum stems, while as productive device the respective kausativum subjunctive/present stem formations were replaced by *sk*-stem formations.

In my view, the finest example of such an oppositional transitive *ā*-stem privative is *eṣpirtacce* 'unturned' from *spārtt*[(a)]- 'turn'. Although Winter, 2001, 130 = 2005, 519 ad 99 now states that *eṣpirtacce* is not a privative of *spārtt*[(a)]- 'turn', he does not offer an alternative analysis, and a meaning 'unturned (i.e., not made to rotate)', as per Hilmarsson, 1991, 61f., makes perfect sense in the respective passages; see the discussion by Hilmarsson, l.c. Furthermore, a stem **ṣpārttā*- is also presupposed by one — and indeed the most archaic — of the three stem variants of the Prs/Sub IXb of the Kaus. I of *spārtt*[(a)]- 'turn': we have the regular stem *spārttäsk*- beside *spārttāsk*- (with preservation of A-character) and as a third stem allomorph *ṣpārttāsk*- showing preservation of A-character, a different root ablaut, and most probably suffix accent (the importance of this stem allomorph was already pointed out by Hilmarsson, 1991, 62 who also added the PPt *peṣpirttu* as a second form derived from this stem allomorph). In other words, the *sk*-stem allomorph *ṣpārttāsk*- looks exactly like the *ā*-stem

---

[29] Note that the root vowel pre-PT **e* > PT **ä* met in those *sk*-less formations indeed fits the requirements for the root syllable following the finally lost reduplication syllable as stated above. As a corollary, roots with initial vowel, from which reduplicated formations could not have been built in Late pre-PT and PT times at all, should ideally only have formed Class IXa presents and subjunctives in TB, i.e., *sk*-formations lacking initial accent even if used as true causatives or oppositional transitives, and indeed in the Kaus. II paradigm denoting 'abandon' from *ār*[(a)]- 'cease' one finds the Prs IX (descriptively IXa) form *arskaṣṣäṃ*, and the Opt from Sub IX (descriptively IXa) *arṣṣītär-ñ*. As for the IXa status of the Kaus. I Prs *parākäsk*- 'make prosper' from *pārāk*[(a)]- 'prosper', note that according to Peters, 2004, 441ff., the initial syllable in this form had developed precisely out of a pre-PT **ä*, i.e., not out of a full vowel.

allomorph *ṣpärttā-* as presupposed by the Priv *eṣpirtacce* plus *sk-*
extension, and can therefore be adduced as support for the claim that
such oppositional *sk*-stem forms of Class IX(b) came into being exactly
by extending the basic *ā*-stem by the *-sk-* suffix. *ṣpärttāsk-* is hence the
oldest structure of these *sk*-stem allomorphs; in a further step,
Tocharian introduced the root ablaut of the grundverb (hence
spārttāsk-), and only in a third step the replacement by *-äsk/ṣṣ-* took
place.

The next two privative examples are compelling as well, at least
with respect to the morphological aspect:

The meaning of *aikacce* is not certain: H 149.45 b 4 //// *te aikaccepi*
kleśanma•. Hilmarsson, 1991, 55f. followed Broomhead's
interpretation: "That [is (the characteristic)] of one who is unable to
destroy the kleśas" (Broomhead I, 196). The fragment certainly
contains an abhidharma text, but the verso side is not very clear, so I
would not exclude a meaning "one who does not avoid the *kleśas*" (or
even "one for whom the kleśas do not disappear"). Since the first
syllable of this form certainly derives from disyllabic PT *æ-w'äyk-,
the following *-a-* can only come from a PT *-ā-; setting up a
subjunctive stem *w'äykā- is therefore unavoidable.

The third example for such a kausativum *ā*-subjunctive is *aitka(tte)*
in 521 a 4 from the root *wätk*[(a)]-. The privative is the equivalent of Skt.
karmāsāṃcetanikaṃ "die Tat, welche unbewußt (getan wurde)" (see
Sieg, 1938, 17), and since the attested forms of the historical
kausativum paradigm from *wätk*[(a)]- seem to have the meaning
'order',[30] *aitkatte* would have to belong to yet another non-grundverb
paradigm. With respect to morphology, setting up a subjunctive stem
of the same kind, viz. a *w'ätkā-, is again unavoidable.

On the other hand, the fourth example *(a)traikatte* in 405 a 2 is
problematic for a couple of reasons. First, the whole passage is
unclear; see the proposed translations in Hilmarsson, 1991, 56
("unbeauftragt", "unbidden", "unverwirrbar"; Hilmarsson himself
favors "unfailing, not misleading"). Pace WTG, it is unlikely that the
form is just based on a TB subjunctive stem allomorph *traikā-
standing beside *trikā-*, because, as Hilmarsson has shown, privatives
of ablauting stems, as a rule, are based on the weak and not on the
strong stem allomorph, and furthermore since *trik*[(a)]- is a Prs III verb, it
is even more unlikely that it ever had an active, full-grade stem

---

[30] The translation 'unbeauftragt' given in WTG, 288 is certainly merely
based on the alleged connection with the kausativum.

allomorph at all (see chap. Prs III/IV 26.2.3.). However, Hilmarsson's claim (1991, 57f.) that *traikā-* is causative and came into being by a couple of analogical replacements is also very unlikely. The best explanation I can think of is that we are dealing here with a mere writing error for †*(a)trikaitte.* A suffix variant *-ai-* for *-a-* is indeed sometimes attested in privatives, see Hilmarsson, 1991, 60f. and 69 who assumes *-ai-* to be an informal-style variant of *ā/ä* before palatals, so that the *-ai-* could have come into being by sound law in the obliquus. On the other hand, we also have a couple of attestations of *-ai-* in the nominative Priv *empalkaitte* (which may show a metathesis of palatalization, see chap. Sound Laws 1.7.). Since *(a)traikatte* is precisely attested in an eastern text from Murtuq, where this kind of sound law is indeed expected, I think that the assumption of an informal-style form †*(a)trikaitte* may be the most likely solution for the problem.

The fifth example *ayātaicce* is also semantically uncertain, though I agree with Hilmarsson, 1991, 60f. that transitive 'unsubdued, untamed' is more likely than intransitive 'indomitable'. To be sure, the transitive form can as easily be derived from the antigrundverb (attested by Prs VIII and Pt III), which can either be an athematic Class I or thematic Class II stem.

Apart from these privatives, Hilmarsson saw further support for his theory of *ā*-subjunctives serving as kausativum stems in the imperatives of Class II. He perfectly correctly pointed out that judged by the root ablaut, these imperatives could not simply have been built from the preterit stems of Class II, but are precisely what one would set up as "causative" *ā*-stems. As is argued in detail in chap. Ipv 37.8., there is indeed much reason to believe that the imperatives are in general originally based on the subjunctive stem of the root and only at a later stage came to be associated with the respective preterit stem.

Now one might first toy with the idea that those pivotal *sk*-less reduplicated causative stems with root vowel PT *e in the active may have derived from PIE reduplicated presents of the τίθημι type,[31] but on a closer inspection such an approach would hardly lead anywhere. There is just one root involved in the Class IXb causative/oppositional transitive business that seems to have formed such a present in PIE,

---

[31] As has been done by Kim, 2003, 225.

viz. the root *kän⁽ᵃ⁾-* from PIE *√ĝenh₁* (PIE Prs *ĝi-ĝenh₁-ti),[32] and precisely *ᴬkän-* did *not* have a Class II imperative, but a Class I or Class III imperative instead.

It is therefore much better to assume an inner-Tocharian origin for those reduplicated presents, and to start precisely with the root *kärs⁽ᵃ⁾-*: From this root, which evidently does not go back to a PIE seṭ root, there existed in pre-PT at least two different preterit formations: *kers-ā- (with suffixal *-ā-) on the one hand and *kērs-ā- (with the *-ā- taken over from *kers-ā-) on the other hand, and both of these stems could be used as their own causatives, just like *iyā-* could act as its own causative.[33] Now, from a preterit *kersā-/*kärsā- there could be formed a new present *kersā-/*kärsā- by the *tēzzi* principle, and this eventually could get reduplicated on the model furnished by the Sub I forms with *æ/ä root ablaut, which in the end looked like the respective Pt III formations provided with primary endings and with a prefixed reduplication syllable. Of course, that new (reduplicated) present also should be expected to have had first both the causative and the non-causative meaning. A quite similar state of affairs can be found, e.g., in Classical Greek, where an active perfect such as ἔφθορε still denotes both 'is one who has destroyed' and 'is destroyed' at the same time. However, Greek in the end preferred formal disambiguation and therefore created a new form ἔφθαρκε that was confined to transitive semantics, and in the same way the speakers of Tocharian may have felt the need to disambiguate formally, and this would have been done by creating a new paradigm *ke-kors-ā-/ *(ke-)kärs-ā- (with the ablaut pattern known from what turned out to be Sub I with *æ/ä root ablaut) that was restricted to non-causative semantics, whereas the older *ke-kers-ā-/*(ke-)kärs-ā- now became confined to causative semantics.[34] On the model of causative *ke-kers-ā-/*(ke-)kärs-ā-, new causative(/oppositional transitive) presents of the same morphological structure then could have been formed from roots/stems of almost any kind of structure, even from roots that

---

[32] Which is usually said to have provided the one and only starting point for the Vedic reduplicated "causative" aorist of the *ájījanat* type; see Kim, 2003, 217ff. with ref.

[33] The reason behind this fact is probably, or at least possibly, that *kers-ā- was based on the instrumental of an abstract h_2-stem *kers-ā (from *-h_2-eh_1?) simply denoting 'with knowledge', and that the other prototypical stems in suffixal PT *-ā-/-å̄- are to be explained in the same way; cf. chap. Pt I 7.3.3.

[34] As would have been predicted indeed by Kuryłowicz's Fourth Law of Analogy.

formed a Pt I having non-palatalizing *ä as root vowel throughout the whole paradigm, and maybe even from roots that otherwise lacked A-character completely (i.e., lacked present and/or preterit stems ending in PT *-ā-). This may be inferred from the fact that in Tocharian A, subjunctives of Class IX in TA -ās- are met with *any* kind of roots,[35] and that in MQ texts, Class IXb forms in -ask- (from PT *-āsk-) are occasionally also found with roots otherwise devoid of A-character.

If all of this is correct, we should expect that there exist Class IXb forms only of the *śarsask-* type, and none of the *śarsäsk-* or **karsäsk-* type. As a matter of fact, there do indeed exist at least some forms of the *śarsäsk-* type with expected *ś-*, i.e., the lautgesetzlich reflex of a sequence **C'ä-*, and even *śarsaṣṣ-* is attested once in a non-MQ text. Such forms with root-initial palatalization and/or with preserved stem-final (*)-ā- are clearly archaisms, and the same then will hold also for the TA subjunctives in -ās-,[36] because, as a rule, Tocharian subjunctive stems tend to be morphologically more archaic than the respective present stems. These archaic forms then show that we are essentially on the right track, and that both the **kä-* and the *-äsk-* found with the many Class IXb stems of the **karsäsk-* type must be due to rather recent, inner-Tocharian innovations.

As for the *-äsk-*, it was shown above that in Tocharian B Class IXb forms sometimes show a suffix allomorph written -ăsk- or -ăṣṣ- instead of usual -äsk-/-äṣṣ-, that is, they show preservation of A-character. Accordingly, we have to do with a secondary TB rule by which the stem vowel -ā- is replaced by -ä- whenever the stem functions as part of a kausativum paradigm even when it does not have initial accent or serve as oppositional transitive/causative (like with *ārt(t)*⁽ᵃ⁾-). This is then even true for secondary *sk*-stems that serve as oppositional kausativum: witness the causative *sk*-stem *ānäsk-* 'make breathe' beside the grundverb *ānāsk-* 'breathe' with preservation of the stem-final -ā- of the no longer productive *sk*-less verb **ān̆ᵃ-* .

As for the loss of A-character in historical Tocharian B, this can, in my opinion, be explained in terms of a rule of posttonic weakening of

---

[35] This argument is, of course, only valid if one is not willing to accept the claim of Hackstein, 2004, 90 that the TA Class IX subjunctives have nothing to do diachronically with the TB Class IX subjunctives, but rather derive from PIE desideratives in *-h₁s-e/o- as set up by Rix, 1977, 147ff.

[36] Except if one prefers Hackstein's alternative view; see the preceding footnote.

PT *-ā- to *-ä-, which, however, became usually opaque due to analogical restitution of *-ā-; see Malzahn, in print c, for more details.

However, for anyone who does not like the idea that in TB/pre-TA (present/subjunctive) Class IX(b) such a marginal phonological rule gained wide acceptance precisely in these two categories, there is an alternative explanation for the substitution of (*)-*āsk*- by (*)-*äsk*- as soon as one accepts the following explanation for the last loose end left, the evident substitution of (palatalized) *e*-grade root variants by (non-palatalized) zero-grade root variants in the presents and subjunctives of TB Class IX and the related TA categories:

If one assumes, for argument's sake, that from the root *√telh₂ Tocharian had inherited a regularly built zero-grade *-sk̑e/o- present *tl̥h₂-sk̑-e/o-, this should have resulted in a pre-PT *täl(ä)ske/o-.[37] Now, if a present *tetela- stood beside an already existing *täl(ä)ske/o-, the two formations could have been blended in various different ways, and among other things result in both *tetälask- and *tetäläsk-, and such forms then could have provided an analogical model for both replacing *-C'ä- by non-palatalized *-Cä- and replacing pre-PT *-ask- > PT *-āsk- by -*äsk*-. Replacing *-C'ä- by non-palatalized *-Cä- could have been further supported by a former presence of *-Cä- in the middle forms of those unenlarged causative/oppositional transitive stems in PT *-ā-, which is indeed presupposed by the "causative" middle imperative *karsar*.

---

[37] For the possible former existence of a pre-PT *tälsk-, compare PT *wärsk- 'smell (itr)' (evidently from *u̯r(H)-sk̑-) presupposed by *wärskānte* 'they smelled (tr)', and also PT *ārsk- 'abandon' presupposed by *arskaṣṣäṃ*, *arṣṣītär-ñ*.

ROOTS IN FINAL -*tk*

A group of Tocharian roots ends in final -*tk*, which is an odd structure from a PIE point of view, so that this root shape has attracted the special attention of scholars. Lane, 1965, 68 = Arndt, 1967, 93 noted that the -*tk* "has nothing to do *per se* with any "tense" stem formation". Pedersen, 1941, 171ff. and similarly Lane, l.c., assumed that these roots started out as denominative stems (derived from alleged participles in *-tokos-), but see the objections by Melchert, 1978, 97f., who also discusses other earlier theories on the *tk*-verbs. Schneider, 1941, 45ff. was the first to assume that we are dealing with a "falschen *k*-Abstraktion aus dem idg. *sk*-Präsenssuffix", further assuming an "intensiv-iterativen, inchoativen Verbalaspekt". Jasanoff, 1975, 111 proposed to derive the verbs in question from *-sk̂e/o-presents made to roots ending in a dental and leading to a cluster in which the *-s- was lost by sound law, discussed in detail by Melchert, 1978. This explanation has become communis opinio, with the exception of Hartmann, 2001, 95ff. and Schmidt, most recently 2006. Hartmann basically comes up with two objections, but does not offer an alternative explanation of his own,[1] see also the objections to Hartmann by Pinault, 2006, 105f. Hartmann on the one hand claims that the roots in final -*tk* show a morphological behavior different from that of the roots in -*sk*, and on the other hand that a sound law *-T-sk̂- > PT *-tk- is otherwise unproven. However, Pinault, 2006, 103ff. has now shown that there is indeed evidence to be found for that sound law outside these verbal forms. Pinault, 2006, 105f. further points out that the *-sk̂e/o- present stem solution is indeed supported

---

[1] For an alternative solution, Hartmann refers to Schmidt. Schmidt, 1988, 471ff.; 1995, 275ff.; 2006, 557ff., based on an idea by Winter, 1960, 184, has put forward the idea of "Laryngalverhärtung", i.e., a sound law *h_2 > -*k*-. But see the objections by Pinault, 2006, 103f. (with ref.) and see also Hackstein, 2000, 99 with respect to *kätk*-: "Als ungelöste Gravamina von Schmidts Etymologie [von *kätk*- < *$d^hg^{wh}nh_2$-] stehen die singuläre Metathese *tk-k-* → *kt-k-*, der fehlende Reflex des Labiovelars in A *kätk*- nach wie vor im Raum". For the indeed striking synchronic pairing of nasal (infix) present stems with verbs in root-final -*tk* (and -*sk*), see below in the main text.

by a couple of excellent etymologies: ᴬ*yutkᵃ*- 'be worried' < *Hi̯udʰ-
sk̂e/o- 'be agitated', *litk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'avert, remove' < *lit-sk̂e/o- beside non *sk̂*-
stem *litᵃ*- 'fall' < *lit-, *wätk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'decide, etc.' < *u̯i-dʰh₁-sk̂e/o-, *nätkᵃ*- 'hold
distant, push away' < *nud-sk̂e/o-.

In addition, Koller, 2008, 25ff. argues that when applying the
framework of Government Phonology to TA roots, one gets a root-
structure template in which both roots in TA -*tk* and TA -*Cw*
(certainly from PIE *-C-u̯e/o-) do not fit. In contrast, both act as if -*k*
and -*w* were root extensions, because of their treatment of *ä*/zero
alternation and their palatalization products.[2]

As for Melchert's claim that the roots in -*sk* and the roots in -*tk*
behave in a rather parallel way, this is explicitly denied by Hartmann,
2001, 104ff. However, the absolute figures (see Hartmann's table on p.
110 and my list below) are not really so high that one should argue
with statistics at all.[3] The only really striking bit of statistics is that in
Tocharian B roots in -*sk* have rather often thematic subjunctive/
present stems of Class II (i.e., simply continue the inherited stems in
*-sk̂e/o-),[4] while there is only one *tk*-verb showing a similar thematic
subjunctive (*kātk*-/ᴬ*kātk*- 'rejoice'). Melchert argued that the simple
thematic inflection to be expected for the Prs/Sub of *tk*-roots was
secondarily replaced either by nasal inflection (basically in the case of
transitive ones), or by Class III inflection (in the case of intransitive
ones). Now, Hartmann claims that *sk*-roots do not (or only to a much
lesser extent) show a similar transfer. But if one looks at the material
again, it turns out that this seeming disproportion can be explained.

---

[2] In *tk*-roots only the -*t*- but not the final -*k*- gets palatalized, cf. Ger TA
kackäl from ᴬ*kātk*- or 3.sg.act. Pt III TA *pyockäs* from ᴬ*pyutk*-.

[3] To be sure, some of the verbs analyzed as *sk*-roots by Hartmann, 2001,
104ff. such as *anāsk*- are so recent *sk*-roots in the synchronic system of TB or
TA that I do not take them into account in the discussion concerning an
assumed parallelism between *sk*-roots and *tk*-roots. My own figures are
therefore quite different from those of Hartmann.

[4] The TA match of TB -*sk* is usually also -*sk* with the only exception of
pāsk-/ ᴬ*pās*- 'protect' < PIE *ph₂-sk̂e/o-. This root is the only one keeping the
inherited thematic inflection, while all roots in -*sk*- were turned into A-
character roots with (*)-*ā*-, of course, not triggering palatalization.

32.1.   Verbs in Root-Final -*sk*

With[5] thematic subjunctive:

kärsk- 'shoot (an arrow)' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I+pal);[6] *kärsk-* '?' (?) (—) (II/-/-); *ñäsk-* 'demand, desire' (tr) (x/a/a) (II/II/I+pal); *nāsk-* 'bathe, swim' (itr) (a+/a/a) (II/II/I+pal); *nusk-* 'squeeze, (de)press' (tr) (x/-/a) (IXa/II/III); *musk^(ä)-* Antigv. + Kaus. II 'make subside' (tr) (a/-/-) (IXb/II/-); *pāsk-* 'protect, obey' (tr) (m+/x/m) (II/II/I+pal) = ^A*pās-* (m/m/m) (II/II/I+pal); *yāsk-* 'beg' (tr) (m/m/m) (IXa/II/I+pal); *wäsk-* '?' (?) (-/-/a) (-/-/I+pal).[7]
Here maybe also belong: *re(-sk)-* 'flow' (itr) (a/-/-) (IIoIXa/-/-); *wlā(-sk)-* '± exude' (tr) (a/-/-) (IIoIXa/-/-).

Without attested subjunctive, but probably lacking A-character:

^A*trisk-* 'sound, boom' (itr) (a/-/-) (VIII/-/-).

With Prs III and *ā*-subjunctive:

^A*pärsk^(ä)-* (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) ~ *pärsk^(ä)-* (itr) (a/a/a) (V/V/I-pal); *mäsk^ä̆-* 'become, be' (itr) (m+/-/a) (III/V/I) = ^A*mäsk^(ä)-* (itr) (m+/-/a) (III/-/III); *musk^(ä)-* 'disappear, perish' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I) = ^A*musk^ä̆-* (itr) (-/-/m) (-/V/I-pal); ^A*mlusk^ä̆-* 'escape' (itr) (m/a/-) (III/V/I-pal).

With nasal present and *ā*-subjunctive:

pälsk^ä̆- 'consider, think' (tr) (x/x/x) (VI/V/I-pal) = ^A*päl(t)sk^ä̆-* (tr) (x/-/x) (VII/V/I-pal); ^A*māsk^(ä)-* 'be difficult' (itr) (m/x/m) (VII/V/I-pal); *mrausk^(ä)-* 'feel disgust' (itr) (m/m/m) (VI/V/I-pal) = ^A*mrosk^(ä)-* (itr) (m/-/m) (VII/V/I-pal); ^A*wāsk^(ä)-* 'move, quake' (itr) (m/-/m) (VII/V/I-pal) ~ *wäsk^(ä)-* (itr) (m/-/m) (XII/V/I-pal); ^A*wnisk^ä̆-* '± crush, torment' (tr) (a/-/-) (VII/-/I-pal).

With *ā*-subjunctive and other (or unattested) present classe(s):

---

[5] I exclude roots that seem to be clearly inner-Tocharian *sk*-extensions such as *ān^(ä)-sk-* 'breathe in', and the same holds for *wär^(ä)-/wärsk-* 'smell'. Further, I only list roots with grundverb stems and leave out those from which only kausativum stems are attested, because such cases are not diagnostic for A-character. *sk*-stems for which only a kausativum paradigm is attested are: *mäsk-* '(ex)change', *räsk-* '± spice (?)'; unclear are: *tāsk^?-* '± tread on' (?) (—) (-/?/-), ^A*yäsk^?-* '?' (only PPt).

[6] Since the *ā*-preterit shows root-final palatalization, it can safely be assumed that the root had a thematic subjunctive of Class II. In the following, I will indicate Pt I verbs with root-final palatalization by "+Pal", those without palatalization by "-Pal".

[7] See the preceding footnote.

kälsk[ä]- 'disappear, set' (?) (—) (-/V/-); *käsk*[(ä)]- 'scatter' (tr) (x/x/m) (XII/V/I-pal); [A]*täsk*- 'resemble' (itr) (—) (II/-/-); *träsk*[ä]- 'chew' (tr) (a/-/-) (II/V/-) = [A]*träsk*[ä]- (tr) (-/a/-) (-/V/I-pal); [A]*trusk*[ä?]- 'yoke' (?) (—) (-/-/I-pal);[8] *näsk*[ä]- 'spin' (tr) (-/a/-) (-/V/-) = [A]*näsk*[ä]- (tr) (-/-/m) (-/-/I-pal); [A]*näsk*[ä?]- '?' (?) (—) (-/-/I-pal);[9] *pärsk*[(ä)]- 'be afraid' (itr) (a/a/a) (V/V/I-pal) ~ [A]*pärsk*[(ä)]- (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I-pal); *wāsk*[(ä)]- 'stir, move, quake' (itr) (m/-/m) (XII/V/I-pal) ~ [A]*wāsk*[(ä)]- (itr) (m/-/m) (VII/V/I-pal).

32.2. VERBS IN ROOT-FINAL -*tk*

With[10] athematic subjunctive of Class I:

putk- 'shut' (tr) (-/a/-) (-/I/III); *plätk*- 'overflow, develop, arise' (itr) (-/a/a) (II/I/III) = [A]*plätk*- (itr) (—) (-/-/III); *wätk*[(ä)]- Antigv. 'separate, decide' (tr) (-/a/a) (-/I+II/III); most likely also [A]*plutk*- '± arise' (itr) (-/-/a) (-/-/III) ~ *plutk*- (only PPt, probably from Pt III).

With thematic subjunctive:

kātk- 'rejoice, be glad' (itr) (a+/-/a) (II/II/I+pal) = [A]*kātk*- (itr) (a+/-/-) (II/-/-).

With Prs III and *ā*-subjunctive:

prutk[(ä)]- 'be shut, be filled' (itr) (m/m/a) (III/V/I-pal) = [A]*prutk*[(ä)]- (itr) (-/a/a) (-/V/I-pal); *mlutk*[ä]- 'escape' (itr) (m/m/-) (III/V/-); [A]*yätk*[ä]- '?' (?) (—) (III/-/-); [A]*yutk*[ä]- 'be worried' (itr) (m/-/-) (III/V/I-pal); *wätk*[(ä)]- 'decide, differ' (itr) (-/x/a) (-/V/I-pal) = [A]*wätk*[(ä)]- (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I-pal); *sätk*[(ä)]- 'spread out' (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I-pal) = [A]*sätk*[(ä)]- (itr) (m/-/a) (III/V/I-pal).

With nasal present and *ā*-subjunctive:

[A]*kätk*[ä]- 'arise' (itr) (x/a/a) (VII/V/I-pal); *kätk*[(ä)]- 'cross', 'pass' (tr/itr) (x/x/a) (VI-VII-IXa/V/I-pal) = [A]*kätk*[(ä)]- (tr/itr) (x/a/a) (VII/V/I-pal); *kutk*[ä?]- 'embody' (tr) (-/-/a) (VII/-/I-pal) = [A]*kutk*[ä?]- (tr) (-/-/m) (-/-/I); *klutk*[(ä)]- 'turn, become' (itr) (m/-/-) (VII/V/I-pal); *nätk*[ä]- 'hold distant, push away' (tr) (a/a/x) (VI-

---

[8] Since the only attested PPt ends in -*sko*, the root most likely had A-character.

[9] See fn. 6.

[10] Like in 32.1., I list here only those roots from which grundverb stems are attested and exclude those from which only kausativum stems are attested, i.e.: [A]*tätk*- '?', [A]*nätk*[(ä)]- 'hold off', *pyutk*-/ [A]*pyutk*- act. 'come into being', mid. 'create', [A]*rätk*[?]- '± raise', *litk*[(ä)?]- 'remove', [A]*lutk*[(ä)?]- 'make, turn into'. Unclear are: *kärtk*[?]- '± decay' (?) (a/-/-) (IX?/-/III), *yätk*[ä?]- '?' (IX?/-/-), *snätk*[?]-/ [A]*snotk*[?]- 'suffuse' (only PPt).

VII/V/I-pal); *pātk^ᵃ-* 'give up' (?) (-/a/-) (-/V/I-pal); *putk^⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'divide, separate' (tr) (x/a/x) (VII/V/I-pal) = *ᴬputk^ᵃ-* (tr) (x/a/a) (VII/V/I); *rätk^ᵃ?-* '± (arise)' (itr) (a/-/-) (VII/-/-); *rutk^ᵃ-* '(re)move' (tr) (m/a/x) (VII/V/-) = *ᴬrutk^ᵃ-* (tr) (m/-/a) (VII/V/I); *lātk^ᵃ-* 'cut off' (tr) (a/-/m) (VI/V/I-pal) = *ᴬlātk^ᵃ-* (tr) (x/-/-) (VII/-/I); *ᴬwrātk^ᵃ-* '± prepare, handle (meat)' (?) (a+/-/-) (VII/-/-); *ᴬspāltk^ᵃ?-* '± strive for' (itr) (m/-/-) (VII/-/-). Note also: *klautk^⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'turn, become' (itr) (m/a/a) (IV/V/I-pal) ~ *ᴬlotk^ᵃ-* (itr) (a/a/a) (VII/V/I-pal).

With present class not attested:

märtk^ᵃ- 'shave' (tr) (-/m/m) (-/V/I-pal) = *ᴬmärtk^ᵃ-* (tr) (-/-/x) (-/-/I); *mutk^ᵃ?-* 'pour (out)' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/-/I-pal); *ᴬlitk^⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'remove' (tr) (-/-/a) (-/V/I-pal) (~ *litk^⁽ᵃ⁾?-* (tr) (a/a/a) (IXb/II/III)).

The intriguing point about the roots in final *-sk* is that a high percentage of them indeed also show A-character, and that a lot of these also have Class III or nasal presents[11] rather than Class II presents, which is fully in line with what Melchert argued with respect to the *tk*-roots (i.e., that these roots have old thematic presents[12] replaced by both nasal and Class III presents). The questions still to be answered are why only certain roots in *-sk* acquired A-character (apparently already in Proto-Tocharian), and others did not (i.e., those with preserved thematic inflection in the

---

[11] Note that it was precisely the nasal-infix class that became a productive present stem formation for A-character roots in *-sk* and *-tk* and note further that in Tocharian B the nasal-infix present has athematic inflection, although I think that there are some relic forms showing the same *ā*-inflection as the TA nasal-infix presents from roots with root-final TA *°tk, °sk, °lk*. As is argued in chap. Prs VII, this particular class can be explained via metathesis of *-n-* in *nā*-presents. In any case, there is certainly an affinity of roots ending in *-k* with the nasal-infix class, because, in fact, all roots of the TB nasal-infix class end in root final *-k*, and the same, as was said above, is true for Tocharian A. Accordingly, one may claim that roots in final *°tk* and *°sk* having acquired A-character show a nasal-infix present stem because of an inner-Tocharian affinity of nasal-infix presents and *k*-roots, as per Adams, 1988a, 68.

[12] *klāp^ᵃ-* '± touch', which has a clearly inherited Prs II *klyeptär* beside an also clearly secondary *ā*-subjunctive (< PIE *√klep), also shows once a Prs VI form (Ger I *klawwanalle*). This root, among others, shows that nasal presents were indeed productive beside *ā*-subjunctive stems. Further note that the *sk*-root *trāsk^ᵃ-* 'chew' (as pointed out by Melchert, 1978, 126) also shows a secondary *ā*-subjunctive beside an *ē*-grade present stem, viz. *tresk-* (but this must also be secondary, because the PIE *-sk̂e/o- stem to be expected would rather have been PIE *tr̥h₃ĝ-sk̂e/o- > *tärsk-).

present/subjunctive stem), while almost all verbs in root-final *-tk* received A-character with the noticeable exception of ^{AB}*kātk-* 'rejoice' and the four roots *putk-*, *plätk-*, ^{A}*plutk-*, and *wätk*$^{(ä)}$- Antigv. that all have a Class III preterit[13] — note that in contrast there is just one single root in *-sk* forming a Pt III that is not evidently secondary,[14] viz. *nusk-* 'squeeze, (de)press', which may indeed be taken for another (slight) difference in behavior of *sk-* and *tk-*roots calling for an explanation.

As for the origin of A-character in both kinds of roots, it becomes obvious from various forms[15] that at the beginning presents in *-sk-e/o- were at least quite often teamed together with respective preterits in pre-PT *-skā-, which can be interpreted as aorists of denominatives formed from PIE abstracts in *-sk̂-eh₂- that could be rather regularly derived from present stems in *-sk̂-e/o- (see for such abstracts, e.g., Melchert, 1978, 100). On the basis of such preterits new presents (later > subjunctives) in PT *-skā- could be formed rather automatically, which in the end could either oust the lautgesetzlich results of the original *-sk̂-e/o- presents or not. As it seems, much more monosyllabic PT *-sk'ä/æ- presents resisted a substitution by a respective present (> subjunctive) stem in PT *-ā- than did (also monosyllabic) PT stems in *-tk'ä/æ- (guaranteed to have once existed at least by the testimony of *kātk-* 'rejoice, be glad', which has both Sub and Prs forms of Class II). On the other hand, with the exception of *nusk-* monosyllabic present stems in *-sk* evidently could also escape a reanalysis as root presents at least somewhat better than (also monosyllabic) present stems in *-tk'ä/æ-. But this is precisely what one should have expected and even predicted regardless of the diachronic provenance of the final *-tk* of *tk-*roots, because whereas stem-final *-tk'ä/æ- just showed up in a certain number of roots and was not a productive suffix at all, *-sk'ä/æ- continued to be an

---

[13] The fact that three out of these four roots have a Sub I (instead of Sub II as of course to be expected if they indeed originated from *-sk̂e/o- presents) can be explained as a result of backformation — the most frequent relevant Sub/Pt pattern of TB being Sub I/Pt III.

[14] As is the case with ^{A}*mäsk*$^{(ä)}$- 'become, be'.

[15] Viz., the two synchronically completely irregular, and therefore archaic paradigms Prs IXb *ārṣṣalle* / Sub IXa *arṣṣītär-ñ* / PPt (from Pt I) *ārskoṣ* (from which was back-formed Prs IXa *arskaṣṣäṃ*), all forms from Kaus II 'give up, abandon' of *ār*$^{(ä)}$- 'cease, come to an end', and the Prs II *warṣṣäṃ* 'smell (itr)' / Sub II *warstsi* 'smell (tr)' / Pt I *wärskānte* 'smell (tr)' from *wärsk-* 'smell (itr/tr)'.

extremely productive present(/subjunctive) suffix (in the synchronic variant (*)-*äsk*- after non-syllabics) in PT times, so that a preservation of any present in *-sk'ä/æ- and an analysis of any stem-final *-sk- as suffixal rather and not forming final part of a root must have been backed by the very existence of countless suffixal formations in *-(ä)sk'ä/æ-.[16]

---

[16] Note again the case of *wärsk*- 'smell (itr/tr)'; as it seems a pre-PT stem *u̯ärsk(ā)- remained unchanged in the preterit (witness 3.pl.mid. *wärskānte*), but was turned into pre-PT *u̯äräsk- (or PT *wäräsk-) (i.e., a Prs/Sub IXa stem with suffixal *-äsk- instead of a Prs II stem) in the (pre-)PT present, eventually resulting in *warsk*-, not †*wärsk*- (witness *warskemane*, *warskalle*); see s.v. *wär⁽ä⁾*- 'smell'.

THE PRESENT AND SUBJUNCTIVE OF CLASS X

33.1.   SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRESENT AND SUBJUNCTIVE CLASS X

The following 26 verbs form a present of Class X, which show the usual accent in Tocharian B (= Xa) (17 TB, 18 TA, 9 TB = TA):

au-n-/ ^A^o(-n)- act. 'hit, wound', mid. 'begin', *käm-/ ^A^kum-* 'come', *käry^ä^-* 'buy, trade', *käl^ä^-* 'lead, bring', *kli-n-/ ^A^kli-n-* 'be obliged to', *^A^klyos-* 'hear, listen to', *täm-* mid. 'be born, come into being'/ *^A^täm-* mid. 'be born, come into being', act. 'beget, generate', *tär-* '± comfort, soothe', *^A^näk-* mid. 'fall into ruin, disappear', *^A^pāś-* 'beg', *^A^päk-* mid. 'cook, ripen', *päk^ä^-/ ^A^päk^ä^-* 'intend', *pi(-n)-* '?', *mäl^(a)^-* '(op)press, crush, deny', *^A^y^ä^-* 'go, travel', *yäk^ä^-/ ^A^yäk^ä^-* 'be careless', *yäp-* 'enter, set (sun)', *yänm^(a)^-/ ^A^yom^(a)^-* 'reach, achieve', *^A^yär^(a)^-* 'bathe; purge (ritually)', *ri-n-/ ^A^ri(-n)-* 'leave, give up', *lä-n-t-* 'go out, emerge', *^A^wäl-* 'die', *^A^śi-* '?', *si-n-* mid. 'satiate oneself, be depressed'/ *^A^si-n-* mid. 'satiate oneself, be depressed', act. 'satiate', *sai-n-* 'lean on, rely on', *^A^tsäk-* mid. 'burn'.

A Class Xb (kausativum) present/subjunctive with initial accent in Tocharian B is attested for three verbs (all of which have a respective Xa present in the grundverb); the active, transitive stems *^A^täm-* 'beget, generate' and *^A^si-n-* 'satiate' correspond to a TB Class Xb verb; in these TA cases, valency change is not expressed by accent but by voice alternation:

täm- Kaus. I/ (*^A^täm-* act.) 'beget, generate' (TB = Sub Xb), *yänm^(a)^-* Kaus. IV 'make obtain' (only Sub Xb), *si-n-* Kaus. I/ (*^A^si-n-* act. 'satiate') act. 'satiate', mid. 'get depressed'.

Present/subjunctive Class X is characterized by a suffix PT *-nā-s(')k(')ä/æ- > -nāṣṣä-/-nāske-*, TA *-nāṣä-/-nāsa-* for roots with A-character, and PT *-nä-s(')k(')ä/æ- > -näṣṣä-/-näske-*, TA *-näṣä-/-näsa-* for roots without A-character (but note the different outcome in Tocharian A due to anaptyxis and syncope of TA *-ä-*, on which see Hackstein, 1995, 288f.).

    Note the metathesis of *-mn-* to *-nm-* with roots ending in *-m* (1.sg. *tanmäskau* from *täm-*). In Tocharian A, TA *-n-* is lost in a sequence TA *-mns/ṣ-*, so we have 1.sg. TA *kumsam*.

	TB Non-A-char.	TB A-char.	TA Non-A-char.	TA A-char.
1.sg.act.	*tanmäskau*	*yänmāskau*	*kumsam*	—
2.sg.act.	*tanmäst*	—	*klināṣt*	—
3.sg.act.	*tanmäṣṣäṃ*	*yänmāṣṣäṃ*	*kumnäṣ*	—
1.pl.act.	*lnaskem*	*klāskem* (sic)	*klyosäṃsamäs*	—
2.pl.act.	—	*yänmaścer* (MQ)	—	—
3.pl.act.	*tanmäskeṃ*	*yänmāskeṃ*	*klyosäṃseñc*	*yomnāseñc*
1.sg.mid.	—	—	*tsäknäsmār*	*ynāsmār*
2.sg.mid.	*rinastar*	*päknāstar*	*rināṣtār*	*päknāṣtār*
3.sg.mid.	*rinastär*	*päknāstär*	*tsäknäṣtär*	*päknāṣtär*
1.pl.mid.	*rinaskemntär*	—	—	—
2.pl.mid.	*śanmästär*	—	—	—
3.pl.mid.	*rinaskentär*	*päknāskentär*	*tskäṃsantär*	*päknāsantär*
nt-Part	*tänmaṣṣeñca*	*yänmāṣṣeñca*	*riṃṣant*	—
m-Part	*tänmaskemane*	*yänmāskemane*	*rināsmāṃ*	*päknāsmāṃ*
Ger/Abs	*tänmaṣṣälle*	*yänmāṣälyī*	*tmäṃṣäl*	—
Inf			*rinässi*	*yär(n)āssi*

A present of Class X can be associated with different paradigms, and it is both attested from roots with A-character and without A-character, which tallies with the fact that the Class X present stem formation is certainly an inner-Tocharian device for the creation of new present stems (although not a very productive one). In Tocharian B, an intransitive Prs Xa may have an oppositional transitive Prs Xb beside it with initial accent. In Tocharian A, this kind of distinction by accent is not possible, so that the intransitive Prs X and the transitive Prs X from ᴬ*täm-* are differentiated by voice alternation.

A subjunctive of Class Xb is only found in TB (kausativum) paradigms associated with a present of Class Xb, so that one can safely assume that these are secondary stems based on the pattern of *sk*-stems with Prs IXb/Sub IXb.

The oppositional Class Xb stems can show the usual loss of *ä in metrical passages: 3.sg. *tanmṣäṃ* (Š, metrical) for *tanmäṣṣäṃ* from *täm-*. *ä*-deletion in originally closed syllables (i.e., before original geminates) is also attested for the Prs X of ᴬ*wäl-* 'die': 3.sg. TA *wläṣtär* beside TA *wällāṣtär*, and TA Inf *wlässi* < *wällässi*.

33.1.1. *The form of the suffix and the question of root extensions in -n-*

Present stems such as *yänmaṣṣäṃ* from *yäp-* standing beside an athematic subjunctive stem *yäp-* show beyond doubt that it is justified to set up a productive present suffix *-näsk-*. As for differentiating such suffixal Class X presents and roots with a nasal extension and *sk-*presents, Lane, 1953, 490 stated that all roots ending in a vowel have generalized the *-n-* in the non-present stems, in contrast to roots ending in a consonant. The respective cases are: *au-n-/ ᴬo(-n)-* act. 'hit, wound', mid. 'begin', *kli-n-/ ᴬkli-n-* 'be obliged to', *pi(-n)-* '?', *ri-n-/ ᴬri(-n)-* 'leave', *si-n-/ ᴬsi-n-* 'satiate oneself', 'be depressed', *sai-n-* 'lean on, rely on'. The synchronic justification for not simply setting up a Tocharian root *aun-* with a present of Class IX comes from Tocharian A, where we still have forms without nasal extension. Since these nasal roots constitute a separate group, it is justified to keep a root like *kli-n-* < pre-PT *klinu-* distinct from, e.g., a case like *kän⁽ᵃ⁾-* < PIE *ǵenh₁-*, even though in the case of *kli-n-* there are only nasal-stem forms attested in Tocharian.

33.2. Diachronic Treatment

The thematic present stem formation with the suffix PT *-nā/ä-sk-* is certainly an inner-Tocharian creation based on *sk-*extensions from nasal stems, cf. Hilmarsson, 1991a, 108, and in detail Hackstein, 1995, 285ff. with ref. This is quite clearly to be seen in the synchronic association with nasal subjunctive stems, cf., e.g., *päkᵃ-* 'intend', Sub *päknā-*, Prs *päknäsk-*. Hackstein, 1995, esp. 325 identifies the following inherited nasal present formations (> Toch. subjunctive stems): *käryᴬ-* 'buy, trade' ← PIE *kᵘri-n-h₂-*, *kälᵃ-* 'lead, bring' ← PIE *kl̥-n-h₁-*, *mäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* '(op)press, crush', 'deny' ← PIE *ml̥-n-h₂-*, *ᴬyär⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'bathe; purge (ritually)' ← PIE *h₁r̥-n-h₂-*; for the type *si-n-/ ᴬsi-n-* 'satiate oneself' with nasal extension; see chap. Sub VII 22.2.1.

  Klingenschmitt, 1994, 409 = 2005, 433 fn. 170 assumes that the whole Class X is based on the model of the inherited present stem *känmäsk-* from *käm-* 'come' by reanalysis of PT *kämnäs'k'ä- → *kämnäs'k'ä-; *kämnäs'k'ä- itself came into being by introducing the root allomorph *käm-* into *käns'k'ä- < PIE *gᵘm̥-sḱe-*.[1] To be sure, this is

---

  [1] This analysis may even be bettered by assuming that the PIE proto-form turned into pre-PT *kʷämnsk-* by a sound change like that proposed by Peyrot, 2008, 155ff. in order to explain TB *-mnte.*

one of the two TA/TB Prs X equations from a root without A-character that is not a secondary root with nasal extension. The other such Prs X is *täm-/^Atäm-*, which rhymes with *käm-* and may therefore indeed be analogical to *käm-*.

THE PRESENT OF CLASS XI

34.1.   SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRESENT CLASS XI

A present of Class XI can, in my opinion, only be justified for the following three verbs:

āks-/ ^Aāks- 'announce, proclaim, say', *auks-/ ^Aoks-* 'grow, increase', ^Aoks-Kaus. I 'make grow'.

	TB	TA		TB	TA
1.sg.act.	*aksaskau-me*	*āksisam*	1.pl.act.	—	—
2.sg.act.	*aksasto*	—	2.pl.act.	*aksaścer*	—
3.sg.act.	*aksaṣṣäṃ*	*āksiṣ*	3.pl.act.	*aksaskeṃ*	—
nt-Part	*aksaṣṣeñca*	*āksiṣant*			
m-Part	*aksaskemane*	*āksismāṃ*			
Ger/Abs	*aksaṣṣälle/aksaṣle*	*āksiṣlaṃ*			
Inf		*āksissi*			

The present stem of Class XI is characterized by stem-final *-säsk-/* TA *-sis-*; to be more precise, in my opinion we are only dealing with a Class XI suffix formation when Tocharian A shows stem-final TA *-sis-*, but not when Tocharian A shows TA *-säs-* as equivalent of TB *-säsk-.* Differently, the manuals also classify present stems as Class XI ones if they show the equation *-säsk-/* TA *-säs-* (such as in the case of *suw^a-/ swās^a-* Kaus. I 'let rain'), but this is a matter of opinion; see below.

Present Class XI seems parallel to Class X with the thematic suffix *-näsk-/* TA *-näs-.* However, while Class X has certainly gained some slight productivity in Tocharian, the same cannot be said about Class XI.

34.2.   DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

On the surface, Tocharian A shows two equivalents of TB stem-final *-säsk-*, viz. TA *-sis-* on the one hand, and TA *-säs-* on the other hand. Whereas TA *-säs-* is "zweifelsfrei die lautliche Entsprechung" of *-säsk-*, as per Hackstein, 1995, 328 (with ref.), Hackstein assumes that the variant TA *-sis-* could be explained by a "Kontamination von Prs.

VIII *-*s°* und Prs. X *-*ns*-" with *-ns-* turning into *-ⁱs-* as a result of a sound law detected by Winter, 1981, 130. But since this is not so obvious a solution from a morphological point of view, I want to propose a different explanation.

Actually, TA *-sis-* is attested with *ᴬāks-* 'proclaim' and *ᴬoks-* 'grow', Kaus. I 'make grow', whereas TA *-säs-* is attested with *ᴬsuw⁽ᵃ⁾-/* *ᴬswās⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. I 'let rain' and *ᴬemts⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'seize', the respective present stems of which are analyzed as Class XI stems by the manuals as well (followed by Hackstein, l.c.). Now, *s*-presents or former *sk*-presents in Tocharian A made from roots ending in *-s* do not show a similar raising of *-ä-* to *-i-*, cf. from *ᴬkärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* Kaus. IV 'let know' Prs VIII 2.sg.act. TA *śärs-äṣt* = Prs IXb *śars-äsk-*, and from *ᴬwärs-* 'breathe' Prs VIII 3.sg.act. TA *wärsäṣ.* Accordingly, in my opinion the Kaus. I of *tw^ä-/ twās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'kindle' and *suw^ä-/swās⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬsuw⁽ᵃ⁾-/ᴬswās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'let rain' just like the present stem of *ᴬemts⁽ᵃ⁾-* can easily simply be interpreted as present stem formations of Classes IXa and IXb. As is argued in chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.6.2.3., we are facing here a different kind of root extension, i.e., secondary stems *swāsā-/swāsä-* and *twāsä-* based on **swā-* and **twā-*.

On the other hand, setting up a separate Class XI present with stem-final PT *-säsk-* seems justified for me only in the case of the two roots *āks-/ ᴬāks-* 'proclaim' and *auks-/ ᴬoks-* 'grow', i.e., whenever we have stem-final *-sis-* in Tocharian A. As for the origin of the *-i-* showing up here, if one does not want to set up a former sequence *-sä-ns-* as proposed by Hackstein, l.c., one may follow Peters, 2006, 333, fn. 14, claiming that TA *āksis-* had started out as a "Reimbildung" to semantically related pre-TA **wæys-* 'say', which would have been the expected pre-TA equivalent of TB *wesk-* (from *we-ñ-*).

THE PRESENT AND SUBJUNCTIVE OF CLASS XII

35.1. SYNCHRONIC FACTS ABOUT PRESENT AND SUBJUNCTIVE CLASS XII

The present and subjunctive of Class XII is characterized by a thematic suffix (*)-*ññä/æ*-. A subjunctive of Class XII is always associated with a similar present of Class XII, whereas a present of Class XII can also be associated with a subjunctive of a different stem formation.

The following Class XII present and subjunctive stems are attested (Prs XII: 18 TB, 7 TA, 2 TA = TB; certain Sub XII: 6 TB, 8 TA, 2 TA = TB):

[A]arṣaṣ-[i]ññ- 'fit (of clothes)', *[A]āks*- 'announce, proclaim' (only Sub), *āñm-[ä]ññ*- 'wish, desire', *ārc(-[ä]ññ)*- 'should, ought to', *kāw[ä]*- 'desire, crave', *[A]kāṣ-[i]ññ*- 'reprimand, chastise' (+ Sub), *käsk[(ä)]*- 'scatter', *[A]kñā-ññ*- '± recognize, acknowledge' (only Sub), *[A]krās*- 'vex' (only Sub), *klänts[(ä)]*- 'sleep', *[A]klop-[i]ññ*- 'express sorrow, lament', *kwipe-ññ*- 'be ashamed', *cele-ññ*- 'appear', *tänkw-[ä]ññ-/ [A]tunk-[i]ññ*- 'love, have compassion for' (TB/TA + Sub), *päkw*- 'rely on', *mänt[(ä)]*- 'destroy, be angry', *miw[(ä)]*- 'tremble, quake', *ykāṃṣ-[ä]ññ*- 'feel disgust' (+ Sub), *lare-ññ*- 'love', *wāsk[(ä)]*- 'stir, move, quake', *winā-ññ-/ [A]win-[i]ññ*- 'enjoy' (TA/TB + Sub), *[A]śew-[i]ññ*- 'yawn' (+ Sub), *suk[?]*- 'hang down; hesitate' (only Sub), *[A]s[⸖]ukaṣ-[i]ññ*- 'be happy', *sklok-[ä]ññ*- 'despair', *skw-[ä]ññ*- 'be happy' (+ Sub), *[A]slānk-[i]ññ*- '?' (only Sub), *tsere-ññ*- 'deceive' (+ Sub). Uncertain is: *räs[ä?]*- 'stretch (out)' (Prs V/XII).

	TB Prs	TB Sub	TA Prs	TA Sub
1.sg.act.	—	—	—	*ākṣiññam*
2.sg.act.	—	*tänwät* (MQ)	—	—
3.sg.act.	*mäntaṃ*	*tänwäṃ* (MQ)	—	—
1.pl.act.	—	—	—	*ākṣiññams-äm*
2.pl.act.	*klämtsañcer*	—	—	—
3.pl.act.	*mäntaññeṃ*	—	*tunkiññeñc*	—
1.sg.mid.	*mäntañemar*	—	—	—
2.sg.mid.	*kwipentar*	—	—	*wiñtār*
3.sg.mid.	*mäntantär*	—	*arṣaṣintär*	*kñāñtär*
1.pl.mid.	—	—	—	—
2.pl.mid.	*tserentär*	—	—	—
3.pl.mid.	*skwaññentär*	—	—	—

nt-Part	*täṅwaññeñca*		*tuṅkiññantāṃ*
m-Part	—		*tuṅkiññamāṃ*
Ger	*mäntalle*	*winālye*	—	*akṣiññäl*
Abs	—	*täṅkwalyñe*	—	*ākṣiñlune*
Inf		*täṅkwantsi*	*tuṅkiñtsi*

35.1.1.   *The shape of the suffix*

35.1.1.1. *Depalatalization of ñ in front of -t° and -tsi*

Depalatalization of *ñ* in front of *-t°* and *-tsi* is regular in Tocharian B, cf. 3.sg.mid. *mäntantär* < **mäntañ(ñ)tär* < **mäntáññätär* (see, e.g., Kim, 2007a, 48, fn. 2), and it is also sometimes attested in Tocharian A, but there only in a minority of cases; see Hilmarsson, 1991a, 87 contra TEB I, 216, § 389,3. The two instances of depalatalization in Tocharian A are Prs XII 3.sg.mid. TA *arṣaṣintär* and Prs XII TA *śewiṃtär*; in the infinitive, we only have attestations of palatal TA *°ñtsi*; note that in the subjunctive Class VII the suffix TA *-ñ-* always remains palatal also in front of *-t°*.

35.1.1.2.   *The vowels in front of the suffix*

The suffix certainly has thematic inflection, but there are different vowels attested in front of the *-ññ-*, depending on whether we are dealing with a deverbative or a denominative stem. In deverbatives, we find both non-palatalizing and palatalizing *-ä-*. In denominatives, *-ññ-* is regularly preceded by the vowel that shows up in the final syllable of the basic stem, i.e., **-æ-*, (*)-*ā*-, or (*)-*ä*- (cf. *lare-ññ-* 'love' beside the adj. *lāre* 'lovable').

35.1.1.3.   *The TA shape of the suffix*

In Tocharian A almost all stems show a *y*-epenthesis in front of the (*)-*ññ*- (cf. TEB I, 49, § 15,1), the only exception being *Akñā-ññ-*. According to Hilmarsson, 1991a, 101, in **kñā-yññä/a-* "the presence of three palatal *-ñ-*'s caused a dissimilatory loss of the palatal epenthesis"; but see s.v. *Akñā-ññ-*. In TA *witär* (for **wiñtär*, cf. Sub XII 2.sg. TA *wiñtār*), haplology had occurred, and **winiñ/nt°* no doubt is a much likelier preform than **wineñ/nt°* (pace Hilmarsson, 1991a, 86).

35.1.1.4.   *Loss of (*)-ä- in front of the suffix*

The -*ä*- of Tocharian B and also the -*i*- of Tocharian A that precede the suffix TB/TA -*ññ*- can be syncopated in metrical passages, cf. 1.sg. TA *ākṣñam* (attested two times) beside TA *ākṣiññam*, whereas 2.sg. Opt TA *ākṣit-ñi* for *ākṣiññit-ñi* is rather due to haplology/haplography. In Tocharian B, we have the 3.pl.mid. *ykāṃṣñentär* beside *ykāṃṣämññentär* (sic), both attested in metrical passages (evidently because of the simplification of *-*äññV*- to *-*äñV*- in the informal styles).

In the 3.sg. active forms of Tocharian B, -*äññ*- is regularly truncated, and the accent seems to lie on the ending *-*äṃ*, as, e.g., in 3.sg.act. *mäntaṃ* < *mäntäññäṃ, cf. the MQ form 3.sg. Sub *tänwäṃ* beside non-MQ *tänwaṃ*. Krause, WTG, 101, § 100,3 states: "Aus der Verbindung des Suffixes -*aññ*- mit der Endung -*äṃ* der 3. Sg. Akt. entsteht durch Synkope des Themavokals -*ä*- und Assimilation des -*ññ*- an das schließende -*n* (-*ṃ*) eine Endung -*aṃ*", i.e., he assumes *-*ññän* > *-*ññn* > -*n*; for such a loss of *-*ä*- between two nasals, cf. the parallels mentioned by Klingenschmitt, 1994, 372 = 2005, 403, fn. 107, and note also TA *-*ä/āṣṣäṣ* > -*ä/āṣ* in the 3.sg. active of former *sk*-formations. On the other hand, Pinault, 1989, 141 simply assumes haplology. Note that this kind of 3.sg. active forms is also attested in prose texts, so we are undoubtedly dealing with a real-language phenomenon.

35.1.1.5.   *Loss of A-character*

In Tocharian B, all deverbative presents[1] of Class XII are built from roots with A-character, and all end in non-palatalizing *-*äññä/æ*-, i.e., lose the root-final -*ā*-. In contrast, A-character seems to be retained in denominative formations, at least to judge from *winā-ññ*- 'find pleasure in' ← *winā*-. In Tocharian A, there are only deverbatives in -*ṣiññ*-, and no certain ones from a root with A-character.[2] Note,

---

[1] The only possible example for a TB deverbative Class XII subjunctive comes from *suk?*- 'dangle', but here it is not certain whether we are dealing with a root with or without A-character.

[2] Unlike Hilmarsson, 1991a, I would not exclude the possibility that Couvreur's analysis of the form TA *nwiññāt* in A 222 a 7 as Imp of a Prs XII from a root [A]*nwā*- is correct (Couvreur, 1956, 81), so that we would have an example for a deverbative Prs XII from a root with A-character. Although Hilmarsson accepts that a form from [A]*nwā*- '± bear, suffer' makes as much sense in this passage as one from [A]*win-[i]ññ*- 'enjoy', he seems to argue that a

however, that TA *witär/wiñtār* most probably is the outcome of
*winiñ/nt° by haplology, so that in Tocharian A even *wäynāññ-
evidently had been changed into *wäynäññ- by analogy. This
behavior is reminiscent of that met in many *sk*-formations, most of
which are kausativa, but one may assume different reasons for the
similarity.[3]

35.1.2.   *Root ablaut*

Note the coexistence of *wäskäññ-* as attested in 3.pl.mid. *wäskantär*
(Š)/*wäskäntär* (MQ) and *wāskäññ-* as attested in 3.pl.mid. *wāskäntär*
(MQ)/*waskantär* from *wāsk(a)-* 'stir'. Hilmarsson, 1991a, 77f. believes
that the *ā*-vocalism is just analogical to that of the subjunctive.[4]

35.1.3.   *Deverbatives and denominatives*

As already mentioned above, the class consists of both deverbatives
and denominatives, cf. the distinction in TEB I, 216f., §§ 389ff. between
primary verbs and denominatives; the question is treated in detail by
Hilmarsson, 1991a, 76ff., who sets up the following subclasses:
primary deverbatives (according to him found in Tocharian B only),
secondary deverbatives (according to him found in Tocharian A only),
and denominatives. However, I do not find his additional distinction
useful (see the discussion below).

35.1.3.1. *Deverbatives*

It is conceivable to assume that we are dealing with a deverbative
whenever there are verbal stems attested from the respective root
lacking the suffix -*ññ*-, and a matching noun is absent. Usually, in TB
deverbatives of Class XII the suffix -*ññ*- is only attested in the present
stem, but at least *suk?-* 'hang down' has a clear subjunctive stem of

---

root with A-character could not have a Prs XII stem TA *nw-iññ*-, possibly on
account of TA *kñā-ññ*-; but see for this form s.v. *kñā-ññ*-.

[3] Hackstein, 1995, 29f. quite plausibly derives *mäntäññ*- from a present in
*-n̥-h₂-i̯e/o-; see below.

[4] Hilmarsson, 1991, 39f. suspects that the two instances of *wāskäññ*-, both
of which were readings by Lévi, may just be misreadings, but at least in the
case of H 149.add 124 a 3 (no site mark signature, but apparently MQ
character; on the text see Thomas, 1971, 39f.) we certainly read *wāskänträ* (cf.
IOL Toch 164), and since this is an MQ text, ⟨ā⟩ cannot represent /ä/.

Class XII as well. These deverbative Prs XII stems may correspond to TA nasal presents, or they even may have a nasal present attested beside them in Tocharian B, as emphasized by Hilmarsson, 1991a, 104. I agree with him that the following TB roots from Class XII are deverbatives: *käsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'scatter' (no nasal-present stem attested), *klänts⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sleep' (TA Prs VI *klisnā-*), and *wāsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'stir' (TA Prs VI *wāsänkā-*). Here I would also add *miw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'tremble'. As for *kāwāññ-* beside *kāwᵃ-* 'desire', however, I follow WTG, 227 in assuming that we are dealing with a denominative (cf. *kāwo* 'desire'), because *kāwāññ-* retains the A-character, which is a characteristic of denominatives. Pace Hilmarsson, 1991a, 78ff., I do not connect *suk?-* 'hang down' with *sukᵃ-* '± bring' (Prs VI *suknā-*); see the discussion s.v. *suk?-* 'hang down'. As for *tskäññ-* 'mark' only attested in the PPt, Hilmarsson, 1991a, 82, posits a deverbative from a cognate of the root *ᴬtsäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pull (out)' (Prs VI TA *tsäknā-*), but I rather follow Winter, 1984a, 118 = 2005, 263 in assuming a denominative. The newly attested Prs XII stem of *päkw-* 'rely on' shows Prs XII forms beside those of Prs I, which is a regressive present class.

Tocharian A possesses only "secondary deverbatives", according to Hilmarsson, 1991a, 94ff. Whereas the deverbative stems of Tocharian B (usually) confine the suffix *-ññ-* to the present stem, the "secondary deverbatives" of Tocharian A have introduced the suffix TA *-iññ-* also into the subjunctive, preterit, imperative, and PPt. According to Hilmarsson, the TA "secondary deverbatives" are made from the root: *ᴬāks-* 'announce' (XI/XII/V); *ᴬkāṣ-ⁱññ-* 'scold' (XII/XII/V); *ᴬkñā-ññ-* '± recognize' (-/XII/V); *ᴬkrās-* 'vex' (-/XII/-); and here, according to Hilmarsson, must also be added *ᴬoks-* which has a Prs XI, no Sub, but Pt V beside Pt I. Hilmarsson no doubt correctly argues that the subjunctive stems in TA *-iññ-* of *ᴬāks-* and rhyming *ᴬoks-* replaced former simple thematic subjunctive stems as still attested in Tocharian B. But whereas it is rather obvious that TA *āksiññ-* indeed replaced a former PT *āks'ä/æ-*, scil. for the reason suggested by Peters, 2006, 344, fn. 47 (and that rhyming *ᴬoks-* followed suit), Hilmarsson's other examples are all extremely doubtful; see the respective entries in the verbal index, also on the special case of *ᴬkñā-ññ-* '± recognize'.

35.1.3.2. *Denominatives*

Here belong: *āñm-ᵃññ-* 'wish', *ᴬarṣaṣ-iññ-* 'fit (of clothes)', *kāwᵃ-* 'desire', *ᴬkāṣ-ⁱññ-* 'scold', *ᴬklop-iññ-* 'express sorrow', *kwipe-ññ-* 'be ashamed', *tänkw-ᵃññ-/ ᴬtunk-ⁱññ-* 'love', *ykāṃṣ-ᵃññ-* 'feel disgust',

lāre-ññ- 'love', *wināᵃ-ññ-/ ᴬwin-ⁱññ-* 'enjoy', *ᴬśew-ⁱññ-* 'yawn', *skw-ᵃ̈ññ-* 'be happy', *ᴬsʾᵤkaṣ-ⁱññ-* 'be happy', *sklok-ᵃ̈ññ-* 'despair', *tsere-ññ-* 'deceive'. Possibly also: *ārc(-ᵃ̈ññ)-* 'should, ought to', *cele-ññ-* 'appear', *ᴬkrās-* 'vex', and *ᴬslaṅk-ⁱññ-* '?'.

35.2. DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

The suffix is traditionally derived from denominatives in PIE *-n-i̯e/o-[5] as was at first proposed by Pedersen, 1941, 170.[6] According to Hilmarsson, 1991a, 103f., almost all Tocharian denominatives are indeed based on former *n*-stems such as *āñmän-* 'wish' (*āñme*, obl. *añm*) → *ānmäññ-* 'wish', with the sole exception of *tsere-ññ-* 'deceive' (1991a, 88); I think, however, that it is unnecessary to set up an (otherwise) unattested *n*-stem whenever a Prs XII is found. Pinault, 1994, 134 states that this *i̯e/o*-formation for denominatives became productive in Tocharian in contrast to simple *i̯e/o*-stems, because nasal stems played an important role in the nominal system (cf. also Lane, 1953, 490; Adams, 1988b, 72ff.).

In addition, the Tocharian class apparently also contains deverbatives, cf. Adams, 1988a, 72ff.; Hilmarsson, 1991a, 75ff. In particular, Pinault, 1989, 141; 2008, 584 and Schmidt, 1989a, 312

---

[5] Only TEB I, 216, § 389,4 differs from this generally accepted view by proposing an inner-Tocharian development from *-sñ- for which Krause/Thomas compare the TA subjunctive stem *akṣiññ-*, which are supposed to come from a contamination of the subjunctive suffix TA *-ñ-* with the present stem TA *aksis-*, but this is totally unlikely.

[6] That the Tocharian class contains clear denominatives was, of course, already stated by TG, 362, § 447. Pedersen compared the Tocharian class to the Vedic type *iṣaṇyáti* 'urges', i.e., what was traditionally regarded as a denominative based on an *n*-stem (but see Kuiper, 1937, 45f., 65); nevertheless, Pedersen did not comment on his view of the Vedic form. To be sure, the derivational history of this Vedic type is rather a debated issue itself; see most recently Lindeman, 2001, 43ff.; Praust, 2004, 371, fn. 8 (with ref.). Jasanoff, 2003, 125f. derives the type *iṣaṇyáti* from ultimately the same deverbative suffix *-n̥h₂i̯é/ó-* normally leading to Ved. *-āya-* by assuming a sound change *-n̥i̯á- > *-n̥i̯á- > Ved. *-anyá-* in two key formations. In contrast, Tocharian indeed possesses clear cases of denominatives to *n*-stems, and this fact was explicitly stated at first by Van Windekens, 1944, 244 and Couvreur, 1947, 62, § 104; see also the ref. in VW II/2, 86. Hajnal, 1996, esp. 287ff. sets up a PIE deverbative in *-énh₂e/o-/*-n̥h₂é/ó-* esp. on Baltic evidence, which, according to him, also underlies Ved. *iṣaṇyáti < *-enHi̯e/o-*.

(followed by Kim, 2007a, 49) trace the deverbatives back to *-n̥h₂-i̯e/o-forms by comparing the type Ved. *gr̥bhāyáti*,[7] so that Pinault, l.c., sets up two different preforms, i.e., a denominative type in *-n-i̯e/o- and a deverbative type in *-n̥h₂-i̯e/o-. Schmidt, l.c., explicitly points out the parallel between Vedic *nā-* and *āya*-presents like *gr̥bhṇāti*, *gr̥bhāyati* and the combination of a TA Class VI present (*ᴬklis-* 'sleep') and TB Class XII present (*klänts⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sleep').[8] Hilmarsson, 1991a, 115 (with ref. to García Ramón, 1986, 503ff.) also emphasizes the parallelism to Vedic and Greek cognates having a present stem in *-neh₂-/-nh₂-beside one in *-n(h₂)-i̯e/o-, so that "[i]t seems probable that the West Tocharian class XII primary deverbatives with their clear connection to the Tocharian *seṭ*-root nasal presents are of the same type as these Greek and Indic verbs".

Note that deverbative Class XII presents, i.e., those not having a Class XII subjunctive/Class V preterit beside them, are indeed all A-character roots. To be sure, only two out of six (respectively five, if *kāwᵃ-* 'desire' is indeed a denominative Prs XII) have a Class VI nasal present cognate in Tocharian A (as for the others, there is either no TA present attested, or we have Prs II or V), and since the combination of Prs VI with Sub V is a common one, one wonders if that connection between Prs XII and Prs VI is really as striking as was assumed by Hilmarsson/Schmidt. As for Tocharian B itself, at least *mänt⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'stir, etc.' has a Prs VI beside Prs XII, and that Prs VI seems to have an older meaning 'stir (clay)' vs. Prs XII 'destroy'.[9] As for *klänts⁽ᵃ⁾-/ᴬklisᵃ-* 'sleep' < PT *klänsā- with TA Prs VI = TB Prs XII, this is either already based on a nasal-infix stem *klin- from PIE *k̂l̥-ne-i̯-/-ni̯- if one follows the etymology by Schneider, 1940, 203f. with *√k̂lei̯ 'lean', or is something more obscure (Adams, 1988a, 32, and DoT, 223, proposes a derivation from PIE *kl̥mH-s-, a cognate of Skt. *klāmyati*). In sum, one cannot exclude that most deverbative Prs XII formations are just secondary, inner-Tocharian present stem formations, as per Adams, 1988a, 74f.

---

[7] For this explanation of the *-ā́ya-* type, apart from the ref. given in Schmidt, 1989a, 312, see also Praust, 2004, 378 with fn. 21.

[8] Schmidt directly connects the Prs XII of *mänt⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'stir, etc.' with Ved. *mathāyati*, deriving both from PIE *mn̥t-n̥h₂-i̯e/o-, but see Hackstein, 1995, 30 and Jasanoff, 2003, 124, fn. 79.

[9] Note that the older meaning 'strike' is not confined to the Prs VI.

THE PRESENT PARTICIPLES

36.1.   THE FUNCTION OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLES

Tocharian has two different kinds of so-called participial formations based on the present stem: one that can be derived from the PIE *nt*-participle and another one from the PIE participle in *-mh₁no- (as per Klingenschmitt, 1975, 161ff. = 2005, 145ff.) or *-m(e/ŏ)no- (as per Melchert, 1983, 1ff). In most IE languages with the exception of Anatolian these two formations of participles have been assigned to active voice (*nt*-participle) and middle voice (*m(h₁)no*-participle), at least as far as productive formations are concerned. As pointed out by Melchert, 1983, 24f., the respective suffixes were not restricted to any particular voice neither in PIE[1] nor in historical Tocharian. For this reason, I want to call those Tocharian formations simply *nt*-participle and *m*-participle in a neutral way.

In Tocharian, both the so-called *nt*- and the *m*-participle have usually active (rarely passive) meaning (cf. TEB I, 184, § 315). That the choice of these suffixes has nothing to do with the category voice can also be gleaned from the fact that verbs that are media tantum may have an *nt*-participle, whereas verbs that are activa tantum may have an *m*-participle.

In his survey on the synchronic function of these participles, Dietz, 1981, passim and 1988, 123ff. has shown that Sanskrit active participles are almost exclusively translated by *m*-participles in Tocharian A and B alike, and that the *nt*-participle rather was a synchronically productive agent noun formation,[2] because these often

---

[1] As evidenced, e.g., by the passive use of *nt*-participles in Hittite, or the Latin *nt*-participles derived from deponential presents.

[2] In the wording of Dietz, 1988, 124 (cf. Dietz, 1981, 13), "das PPs.Akt." is "bei substantivischem, attributivem und prädikativem Gebrauch eine Nominalbildung im Übergang zum eigentlichen Nomen", whereas "das PPs.Med. ... die syntaktische Unterordnung [bezeichnet]". For the *nt*-participles of Tocharian, the most appropriate comparandum then may be the

quite clearly have the semantics of a substantive and render Skt. nomina agentis. For that reason the *nt*-participle is attested in various cases, whereas the *m*-participle is usually not inflected, as noted by Lane, 1952, 35 with fn. 18.

36.2. *nt*-Stems

36.2.1. *The nt-participle*

The so-called *nt*-participles are usually formed from verbs with transitive valency; the few intransitive examples come from the following roots:

i- 'go' (Prs I+II), *käly*- 'stand, be situated' (Prs II), *śāw*- 'live' (Prs II),[3] *ṣäm*- 'sit, remain' (Prs II), *mäsk^ä*- 'be' (Prs III), *wäs*- 'dwell, lie down' (Prs IXa), *täm*- 'be borne, come into being' (Prs Xa).[4]

This restriction is a consequence of the fact that the *nt*-participles actually function as nomina agentis, which is a kind of formation typically found with transitive verbs.

36.2.1.1. *Morphological peculiarities*

36.2.1.1.1. *āksaṣṣeñca*

The *nt*-participle *āksaṣṣeñcantse* (gen.) from *āks^ä*- 'waken' listed in the manuals is based on a restoration by Sieg/Siegling, 1932, 486 (followed by Dietz, 1981, 59) in H 149.329 a 1: *pärkarya no āksaṣ[ṣ]e(ñcatse)* (sic)////. This passage is the equivalent of Uv. 1.19a *(dīrghā) [jāga]r(a)to rātriḥ* "long is the night for someone who is awake" (cf. Bernhard, 1965, 102). According to Dietz, this would be the only case where a present participle of Sanskrit is translated by an *nt*-participle in Tocharian. It is indeed not very likely to restore *āksaṣ[ṣ]e* //// to an *m*-participle, because *-emāne* regularly does not palatalize the preceding stem-final consonant, the *-e-* going back to the PIE

---

oxytone agent nouns of Vedic ending in *-tár-*, for which see Lazzeroni, 1993, 233ff.

[3] As for *śāw*- 'live', this root is basically intransitive but may be constructed with *śaul* 'live the life' in a figura etymologica (on these cases see chap. Valency 4.10.3.), which is exactly attested for *śaul śayeñcai* (31 a 4f., cf. Dietz, 1981, 57).

[4] Note that *aṣṣeñca* in U 18 a 1 has to be read *ṣmeñca*, so that alleged *āsk*- 'sit' is a ghost root and accordingly no further example.

thematic vowel *-o-.[5] Even worse, there is some reason to restore to a nomen agentis in -nta, since the tiny ink trace visible on the edge of the manuscript speaks rather in favor of ⟨nta⟩. As for the initial ā-, in a text with standard character such a writing would imply word-initial accent, i.e., status as a kausativum form. Since the form is, however, used intransitively, this is not a very likely analysis, because there exists actually only one single other intransitive kausativum present in Tocharian, the one built from the root śāw-/ ᴬśāw- 'live'. Accordingly, it is quite tempting to speculate (as already done by Hilmarsson, 1996, 12f.) that the small piece of text where the form is found had MQ character, or was copied from an older manuscript with MQ character, although there is no further striking evidence in favor of such a view.

36.2.1.1.2. śawāñca

śawāñca (Š) from śuwᵃ- 'eat, consume' shows the full-vowel stem variant (*)śāwā- also met in the 3.pl. of the imperfect, and in the whole paradigm of the preterit, from where it must have spread.

36.2.1.1.3. The suffix variants in Tocharian A

In Tocharian A, all nt-participles from athematic stems of Prs Class I show the suffix allomorph TA -änt(-) in both the nom.sg. and in the other cases, independent of the root vocalism (but note the abstract noun TA oñant 'begin', on which see below). On the other hand, all nt-participles from simple thematic present stems of Class II show the allomorph TA -ant in the nom.sg. (independent of the root vocalism), and the allomorph TA -änt- is found in the other case forms only if there is a full vowel in the root, i.e., in cases where we indeed expect vowel weakening by vowel balance (e.g., TA āśant, TA āśänt- from ᴬāk- 'lead'). The other way round, TA ypant from the thematic stem TA *yäpa- shows the expected result as well. Nevertheless, some forms from stems with full vowel in the root such as TA wleṣantāñ from ᴬwles- 'perform' do not show the expected weakening. These cases can only be explained analogically, i.e., as showing spread of the allomorph TA -ant(-) from the nom.sg. The nt-participles made from present Class III always show the allomorph TA -ant(-) in both the nom.sg. and the other case forms, and here the suffix vowel TA -a- is

---

[5] With the sole exception of the palatalized m-Part enäṣṣemāne from Prs IXb of en- 'instruct' in the MQ text H 149.291 a 4 (archaic ductus), which has to be a writing error in the first place.

identical with the suffix vowel of the present stem. The only relevant form possibly attested from a Class IV present stem shows the allomorph TA *-änt-* as a result of weakening by vowel balance, i.e., TA *sparcwäntāśśi* from ^A*spārtw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'turn', but TA *-cw-* rather points to a pre-TA formation in *-e̯e/o-*.[6] For the *nt*-participles based on Class V and VI present stems the allomorph TA *-ānt(-)* is attested both in the nom.sg. and in the other case forms (e.g., in TA *śwānt, śwāntāñ*), and is — as expected — weakened in the one form with full root vocalism TA *kotnaṃt* (from Prs VI). As for Class VIII presents, according to TG, 337 "herrscht hinter stammschließendem *s*, das sich [...] gesetzmäßig in *ṣ* verwandeln muß, in unserer Überlieferung ein regelloses Schwanken zwischen *-ṣänt-* und *-ṣant-*",[7] but this is not correct. Apart from the one exceptional TA *ṣtämsänt(āñ)*, the distribution of TA *-ṣänt-* and TA *-ṣant-* is precisely as should have been expected on the basis of the principles of vowel balance (of course, undetected yet in 1931).[8] The only example of an *nt*-participle from a Class XII present is TA *tuṅkiññantāṃ* from ^A*tuṅk-ⁱññ-* 'love'.

36.2.2. *The lexicalized nomina agentis in -ntā*

In Tocharian B, the *nt*-participles actually all end in (*)-*ñcā(-)*, whereas there exist lexicalized nomina agentis showing (*)-*ntā(-)*, cf. TEB 188, § 322. In Tocharian A, we only find forms ending in TA *-nt(ā-)*.

Note that there also exist other *nt*-formations, which are not nomina agentis, such as the second member of compound TA °*pärkānt*[9] (TA *koṃpärkānt* 'east' ← 'sunrise') from ^A*pärk*^ä- 'arise' (~ TB

---

[6] Note that the form can synchronically as likely belong to the Prs II stem; see chap. Prs III/IV 26.2.2. and 26.5.3.

[7] There is only just one relevant form from a Class VIII present that has stem-final *-s-* rather than *-ṣ-*, the once attested TA *ṣtämsänt(āñ)* with a certain reading of *s* in TA 332 a 2 (as per TG, 337, fn. 1 contra TochSprR(A), where the akṣara in question is rendered as damaged *[ṣ]ä*). If this is not simply a writing error, we should explain *-s-* as result of a dissimilation against the root-initial *ṣ°*.

[8] In the forms TA *kātkṣantāṃ* from ^A*kātk-*, TA *wākṣantāṃ* from ^A*wāk⁽ᵃ⁾-*, and TA *swāṣṣantāṃ* from ^A*swās⁽ᵃ⁾-*, of course, we have to do with pre-TA *-käṣ-* and *-säṣ-*.

[9] Klingenschmitt, 1994, 314 = 2005, 356, fn. 6 plausibly claims that TA °*pärkānt* started out as an aorist participle, but it should be added that the form must be based on the neuter sg. of that aorist participle because it has an abstract meaning, and neuter sg. forms of adjectives can function as adjectival

°*pilko*), cf. Winter, 1988, 776ff. = 2005, 330ff. Parallel formations are TA *koṃwmānt* 'west' (from *Awämᵃ-* 'set'), and TA *koṃypānt* 'west', as per Pinault, 1998a, 363f., from *yäp-/Ayäw-* 'enter'. Here also belongs the abstract *auñento*/ TA *oñant* 'begin(ning)'; see Peters, 2006, 344, fn. 48.

The lexicalized nomina agentis ending in (*)-*ntā(-)*/ TA -*nt(ā-)* are the following (for TA cf. TG, 12, § 20 and for TB cf. TEB I, 151, § 233,1 and 188, § 322; WTG, 44, § 35):

(1) TA nom.sg. *pekant*, TA obl.sg. *pekäntāṃ*, TA nom.pl. *pekäntāñ* 'painter' beside Prs I of *Apikᵃ-* 'paint' (I/V/I) (beside TA *peke* 'painting');

(2) TA nom.pl. *rā(pä)ntāñ* 'musician' beside Prs II of *Aräpˀ-* '± make music' (II/-/-) (beside TA *rape* 'music');

(3) TA nom.pl. *tsepäntāñ* 'dancer' from Prs I of *Atsipˀ-* 'dance' (I/-/-);

(4) TA nom.sg. *āśand* (sic) [= Skt. *sārathī*], TA obl.sg. *āśäṃtāṃ* 'leader' beside Prs II of *Aāk-* 'lead' (suppletive root);

(5) TA gen.pl. *koṣäntāśśi*, TA dat.pl. *koṣäntāsac* 'executioner'[10] beside Prs VIII of *Ako-* 'kill' (VIII/II/III) ~ nom.sg. *kauṣenta*, obl.sg. *kauṣentai*, nom.pl. *kauṣentañ* 'killer' beside Prs VIII of *kau-* (VIII/I/III);[11]

(6) TA nom.pl. *prakṣäntāñ* 'judge' from Prs VIII of *Apärk-* 'ask' (VIII/I/III) (cf. Dietz, 1981, 65) = nom.sg. *prekṣenta* 'judge' beside Prs VIII of *pärk-* 'ask' (VIII/I/III);

(7) nom.pl. *yokäntañ* (MQ) 'drinker' beside Prs I of *yok-* 'drink' (I/I/VI);[12]

(8) nom.sg. *weñenta* 'speaker' beside *we-ñ-* 'speak' (IXa/?/V).

---

abstracts of the adjective they belong to; see Peters, 2007, 265 with ref. Given the fact that in PT there clearly existed a preterit stem *p(')järkā-, I do not think TA °*pärkänt* should rather be derived via a pre-PT proto-form *pärkōnt- from the PIE adj. *bʰr̥ĝʰ-ont- 'high', as was suggested by Nussbaum, 1976, 12.

[10] As a substantive attested only in A 81 b 3 and b 6 with the apparently special meaning 'Henker' (as per Sieg, Übers. II, 24). In all other passages we are dealing with attributive use (obl.sg. TA *koṣäntāṃ*, TA *koṣäntās* 'killing', cf. Dietz, 1981, 42f.).

[11] The *nt*-participle *kauṣeñca* renders the second member of a Sanskrit compound built from √*han* 'hit' (see Dietz, 1981, 41); cf. also the restored nomen agentis *kauṣe(ntai)* in 34 b 2 which would be the equivalent of *hantāram* 'killer' (Thomas, 1968a, 196 doubts the restoration, but keeps silent about it in his commentary of the passage in ²TochSprR(B)).

[12] Adams, DoT, 510, s.v. *yokänta* lists a form *yokänta* allegedly to be found in 565 b 4 as an example of this nomen agentis, but see rather the restoration of that passage by Winter, 1980a, 469 = 1984, 285 = 2005, 225 to *(pra)yokänta spharir-yokä(ñ)* "the crystal *prayogas*".

In Tocharian A, one might have expected all of the lexicalized nomina agentis to be formally identical with the *nt*-participles. Instead the nom. agentis TA *pekant* 'painter', TA *rāpänt-* 'musician', and TA *tsepänt-* 'dancer' look quite different from expected TA †*pikänt(-)*,[13] TA †*rpänt(-)*, and TA †*tsipänt(-)*[14] (cf. TG 351, § 436, fn. 3). Quite obviously, these three TA lexicalized agent nouns were not derived from the verbal stems that function synchronically as the respective present stems, but from some other completely different stems. As far as TA *pekant* is concerned, it is quite evident that the noun is built on the respective subjunctive = preterit stem PT *pæ/āykā-, as already correctly seen by Klingenschmitt, 1994, 314 = 2005, 356, fn. 6.[15]

In Tocharian B, it seems that the *nt*-nomina agentis just like the *nt*-participles are, as a rule, built from the respective present stem of a verb.[16] The noticeable TB exception is *weñenta* which corresponds to the subjunctive stem *we-ñ-*, but, to be sure, the *sk*-present is a secondary formation, so that one has to conclude that the form is an archaism showing the old *sk*-less present stem, cf. Winter, 1977, 153 = 1984, 198 = 2005, 190 (see also chap. Sub VII 22.2.3.1.).

36.2.3.   *The nomina agentis in -ntsā*

There are different shapes of the suffix to be found in the literature. WTG, 47, § 39,4; TEB I, 189, § 325 set up the suffix as *-tsa* and TA *-ts*

---

[13] Cf. the *nt*-Part made from the Prs I stem TA *träṅk-* from ᴬ*träṅk-* 'speak'. It is attested twice and although both times without much context, the two attestations are not used attributively: A 417 b 4 //// *käräm träṅkäntāp* ////; A 422 b 3 //// *(ṣo)ma-kälyme träṅkäntāñ 2(9)*, reading and restoration according to Couvreur, 1966, 175 (but note that Siegling, pers. copy already made the same); the line contains VAV 6.29 d, as per Sieg/Siegling and Couvreur (cf. now Hartmann, 1987, 208), i.e., the form is the equivalent of Skt. *ekāṃśavādinaḥ* 'einseitig lehrend'.

[14] An *nt*-Part from ᴬ*tsip⁷-* functioning as an attribute is restored in A 444 a 3 by Couvreur, 1956, 79 (and already by Siegling, pers. copy); most unfortunately, precisely the root vowel is lost: TA *(-)päntāñ ap(tsaräntu)* "dancing Apsaras".

[15] "Nach dem Vorbild ererbter Aoristpartizipien gebildet zum Konjunktiv- und Präteritalstamm *pā̆ikā-*"; the first part of this explanation is, however, mistaken; see immediately below.

[16] *prekṣent-* from the Prs VIII of *pärk-* 'ask'; *kauṣent-* from the Prs VIII of *kau-* 'kill'. An inherited participle further underlies *cake* 'river' < *tekont- from the root *√tek 'flow' (Adams, DoT, 249; Melchert, 2000, 57, fn. 18). The development of *-ont# to TB *-e* is, however, not too certain; see below fn. 22.

quite certainly on the basis of *aknātsa*/ TA *āknats* 'ignorant', which is attested quite often and always shows a non-geminated *-ts-*. In contrast, the other example *wapāttsa* 'weaver' as it is given in the manuals shows a double consonant in both attestations (375 a 4 and b 2), and the same is true for the second example *tarkāttsa* now attested in PK NS 107 b (a non-MQ text), a passage that is the equivalent of Uv. 17.10 c, so that *tarkāttsa* translates Skt. *takṣaka* 'carpenter' (see Thomas, 1977, 106). Adams, DoT, 576, on the other hand, sets up the suffix shape as *-tstsā* for the example *wapāttsa.* Finally, Schmidt, 2001d, 20, fn. 17 states that the suffix has now rather to be set up as *-ntsa* instead of *-ttsa*[17] based on the newly attested TA equivalent *wāpäṃtsune*, a derivative of TA **wāpaṃts.* Schmidt objects to the reluctance of Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 149, fn. 6 to equate TA **wāpaṃts* with *wapāttsa* and their reconstruction of a feminine **wāpaṃts* instead of a similar masculine form. Schmidt himself, however, keeps quiet about the problem that he has to assume that PIE **-ntih₂* did turn into a masculine stem suffix in *-ntsā*. To be sure, there are some arguments in favor of such an assumption.

There is no productive verbal root beside *aknātsa* 'ignorant' in Tocharian, but in contrast *wapāntsa*/ TA **wāpaṃts* 'weaver' can be derived from *ABwāp^ä-* 'weave'. *tarkāntsa* 'carpenter' has been connected with the root *tärk-* 'turn' by Thomas, 1977, 106 and 110; 1978, 120, fn. 8. However, the root *tärk-* 'twist' is an A-characterless root (in contrast to *tärk^ä-* 'emit'; see the discussion s.v.), so that one should rather set up a new root *tārk^ä-* '± do carpentry vel sim.' for that form, the more since both 'twist' and 'emit' do not fit the noun 'carpenter' too well semantically. Schmidt, 2001d, 20f. with fn. 17 cites another example of this formation, the ablative singular forms *mall[a]ntsasmeṃ* and *mallatsasmeṃ* 'Winzer, Kelterer' < 'Zerdrücker [scil. der Weintrauben]' attested twice in the business letter THT 4062 a 1 and b 2, which Schmidt derives from the root *mäl^(a)-* 'crush'; see the discussion s.v. *mäl^(a)-* 'crush'.

A fourth nomen agentis in *-ntsa* seem further to be part of the compound *tällaikantsa* if this can be analyzed as *tälle-yäkāntsa*, with a

---

[17] Since the akṣaras ⟨ntsa⟩ and ⟨ttsa⟩ are in the great majority of manuscripts indistinguishable, which is exactly true for all attestations of the forms in question, it is somewhat unfair to claim "[v]on allen Tocharologen bisher als *-āttsa* verlesen".

nom. agentis from *yäk-*, a root allomorph of *i-* 'go'.[18] It is attested twice in monastery records and surely denotes some kind of title or profession like 'goer of the burden (*tälle*)', i.e., 'porter' (as per Adams, DoT, 297 and p.c.).

Hilmarsson, 1991, 124f. analyzed *aknātsa* as inner-Tocharian formation based on a verbal stem *knā- plus suffix *-tsā parallel to *wapāttsa* derived from the subjunctive stem *wāpā-. He objects to the connection with Gk. ἄγνωτος, etc., viz. derivation from a PIE *to*-stem *n̥-ĝnoh₃to-, because this formation had the meaning 'unknown', not 'ignorant', and *aknātsa* cannot in any case be a direct outcome of *n̥-ĝnoh₃to- for phonological reasons. One could assume that we have a bahuvrīhi compound with an amphikinetically inflected *ti*-stem *ĝnoh₃ti- 'knowledge' as second member, i.e., *n̥-ĝnoh₃tō(i̯), with *-tō(i̯) > *-tā (but note that Tocharian has otherwise only amphikinetically inflected *i*-stems in pre-Toch. *-oi̯), with -ts- < *-ti̯- intruded from the weak case forms. However, the difference in the shapes of the suffix may also be simply due to a dissimilatory loss, since the root had also an *-n-*.

36.2.4. *The derivation of the suffixes PT *-('æ)ntā(-) and TB -('e)ñcā*

Surprisingly, the suffix allomorph *-enta* of the nomen agentis and also *-eñca* of the participle that is attested with thematic present stems regularly palatalizes the root final, cf. the following examples:

^AB*āk-*: *aśeñca*/ TA *āśant*, *aik-*: *aiśeñca*, *käs-*: *keṣṣeñca*, *ñäsk-*: *ñäṣṣeñca*, *tās-*: *taṣṣeñca*, *täk-*: *ceśeṃñca*, *pāsk-*/ ^A*pās-*: *paṣṣeñca*/ TA *pāṣant*, ^A*wles-*: TA *wleṣantāñ*, *śāw-*: *śayeñca*; the same is true for complex thematic stems such as Prs VIII (*näk-*: *näkṣeñca*). The only exception would be the *nt*-participle of *i-* 'go' *yneñca*, and although the present stem is basically an athematic one, the *nt*-participle is derived from the stem allomorph *yn-*, which is actually confined to forms in which *yn-* is followed by the thematic vowel *-e-*; accordingly, the non-palatalized *yn-* may be either due to analogy or to dissimilatory loss of palatalization.

---

[18] Another possibility would be *tälle-aikāntsa* 'burden knower', also with reanalyzed suffix *-āntsa* added to an A-characterless root. As a third possibility, one may set up a yet unattested root *yäk*^a- '± carry vel sim.', which could be different from *yäk*^a- 'be careless' by forming Sub V, while *yäk*^a- 'be careless' has a Sub VI.

As nomina agentis we have: ^{A}*āk-*: Prs II *āśand*, *kau-/^{A}ko-*: Prs VIII *kauṣenta*/ TA *koṣäntāśśi*, ^{AB}*pärk-*: Prs VIII *prekṣenta*/ TA *prakṣäntāñ*; as for *weñenta* from *we-ñ-*, there does not, of course, exist any †*we-n-* with non-palatalized *-n-*; here ultimately also belongs the derived noun *auñento*/ TA *oñant* 'begin(ning)' presupposing **auñenta*/ TA **oñant* from an athematic present (= subjunctive) stem of *au-n-/* ^{A}*o(-n)-* act. 'hit', mid. 'begin'.[19]

In sum, we have to do with the following suffix allomorphs ('VB' indicates vowel balance):

TA *nt*-participles

	Prs I	Prs II	Prs III	Prs VIII
Nom.sg.	*-änt(/oñant)*	'*-ant*	*-ant*	*-ṣant*
Rest	*-änt-*	'*-ant-* ('*-änt-* +VB)	*-ant-*	*-ṣant-* (*-ṣänt-* +VB)

TA lexicalized nomina agentis

	Prs I	Prs II	Prs III	Prs VIII
Nom.sg.	(*-ant*)	'*-ant*	—	—
Rest	(*-änt-*)	'*-änt-* (+VB)	—	*-ṣänt-* (+VB)

TB *nt*-participles

	Prs I	Prs II	Prs III	Prs VIII
	(*auñento*)	'*-eñca(-)*	*-eñca(-)*	*-ṣeñca(-)*

TB lexicalized nomina agentis

	Prs I	Prs II	Prs III	Prs VIII
	-änta(-)	—	—	*-ṣenta(-)*

36.2.4.1. *The origins of stem-final PT *-ā- and palatalizing suffix-initial PT *-æ-*

The source of the PT stem suffix **-ā(-)* is debated. Hilmarsson, 1987, 42 derived PT **-ā* from PIE **-h₂* he said was abstracted from agentive root nouns made to roots in final laryngeal such as met in PIE **roth₂oi̯-steh₂-* 'standing on a chariot; charioteer'. Such an agentive suffix PT **-ā* could, in his opinion, then be added directly to verbal stems, for which he quotes alleged *rita* 'searching, searcher', and was finally added to any kind of *nt*-participles. However, there is no productive agentive suffix **-ā* in Tocharian. All forms that have been adduced as examples for that kind of formation of the type °*rita* are, in fact, final members of verbal governing compounds (see Malzahn, in print for details).

---

[19] There is just no evidence for a thematic present stem in **auññ-* as was proposed by Hilmarsson, 1991a, 110; see Peters, 2006, 344, fn. 48. Hence, one has to accept that the *nt*-formation was based on the athematic stem (***)*au-n-*, which is still to be seen in the TB Sub I and TA Sub VII. The Prs X is, of course, secondary.

This suffix-final -*ā* has consequently to be distinguished from the suffix-final -*ā* of the participles.

According to Peters, 2004a, 267 fn. 5 (modifying his former views put forth in Peters, 1991), pre-PT word-final *-ās, *-as, *-ants, and *-ōs all resulted in PT *-å̄ > TB -*o*. If this is correct, word-final TB -*a* cannot be derived from any of these sequences, and if it is true that Early pre-PT *-ants turned into Late pre-PT *-as via *-anss > *-ass, then Early pre-PT *-onts should have turned into Late pre-PT *-os (> TB -*e*) via *-onss > *-oss.[20] Accordingly, as far as I can see we will be left with pre-PT *-a (as evidently advocated by Hilmarsson, 1987, 42), *-ā, and *-ōnt as possible sources for the final *-ā met in pre-TB *-nt(')ā and pre-TA *-ntā, and whereas in terms of morphology there is little to recommend pre-PT *-a or *-ā, pre-PT *-ōnt would make excellent sense. In this case, of course, pre-TB *-nt(')ā and pre-TA *-ntā could be taken to reflect blends[21] of the lautgesetzlich result of a pre-PT nom.sg. ending *-ōnt with some other allomorphs of the *nt*-suffix found in the pre-PT paradigm of the *nt*-participles. Assuming pre-PT *-ōnt > PT *-ā seems indeed to be backed by the word-final -*a* of TB decade numerals such as *täryāka* '30', which can hardly be derived from any other sequence than PIE *-ōmt (> *-ōnt), if one prefers a development by sound law for those Tocharian decades at all;[22] see Schindler, 1967, 240; Peters, 1980, 315; Cowgill, 1985, 104 = 2006, 73, and Ringe, 1990, 191.

---

[20] I think these are the developments that should be assumed and/or expected, because in the acc.pl. forms, the nasal met in pre-PT *-Vns must have been preserved into PT times, to judge from TB -*Vṃ* vs. TA -*Vs*. Klingenschmitt 1994, 404 = 2005, 429, however, was of a completely different opinion; for his examples see immediately below.

[21] Especially since even TB -*eñca* and -*enta* show lack of *ā*-umlaut (as already noticed by Peters, 1991, 243, fn. 9), it is safer not to reconstruct formations in *-'æntā(-) already for PT; see also the argument below.

[22] For a non-lautgesetzlich approach, see Rasmussen, 1978, 128f. = 1999, 26, fn. 33. According to Klingenschmitt, 1982, 98 and 1994, 404 = 2005, 429, *täryāka*, etc. rather go back to pre-PT forms in *-ont-s, but as was argued by me right above, this is hardly credible. However, I hesitate to adopt the view of Ringe, 1990, 191, 200, 233f., fn. 40 and his followers (such as Melchert, 2000, 57, fn. 18, who claimed that TB *cake* 'river' "*could* be from a *tékont *'that which flows' instead of an *s*-stem *tékos*") that word-final pre-PT *-nt was lost without leaving any trace neither in TB nor in TA even after any short vowel.

Accordingly, one may set up for the *nt*-participles from athematic verbal stems ending in a non-syllabic the following pre-PT (> PT) paradigm:

nom.sg.	pre-PT *-ōnt	> PT *-ā
acc.sg.	pre-PT *-ont-äm	> PT *-æntä
gen./dat.sg.	pre-PT *-änt-	> PT *-änt(')-
loc.sg.	pre-PT *-ēnt[23]	> PT *-'æ?
nom.pl.	pre-PT *-ont-es	> PT *-ænt'ä

As for the *nt*-participles from thematic stems, these then probably also had a nom.sg. in pre-PT *-ōnt, but as for the rest of the paradigm, non-ablauting pre-PT *-ont- is the likeliest assumption. To be sure, originally there could not have existed a suffix variant pre-PT *-ēnt- in the thematic *nt*-participles, because the lengthened grade of the suffix could in all probability have only arisen in a monosyllabic form of the type *h_1sēnt (for which see Peters, 2004a, 267, fn. 4).

With respect to the palatalizing quality of the suffix-initial PT *-æ-met in *nt-/ñc*-participles and lexicalized *nt*-agent nouns derived from thematic verbal stems, one then has two options: on the one hand, one may derive that PT *-'ænt- from pre-PT *-ont- and assume that the palatalizing quality had been introduced somehow secondarily, i.e., analogically (that is, maybe under the influence of the gerundives in palatalizing *-älle*, which can syntactically be used just like the *nt*-participles); on the other hand, one may derive PT *-'ænt- from pre-PT *-ēnt one can set up for loc.sg. forms of athematic root presents (such as *h_1sēnt), as actually has been done by Peters (2004a, 267, fn. 4; 2006, 344, fn. 48). According to Peters' scenario, PT *-'ænt- < pre-PT *-ēnt(-) was not original with the thematic formations, but must have spread there from the athematic ones, which is in accordance with the palatalization also seen in *auñento/* TA *oñant* 'begin(ning)' (probably based on a lost *nt*-participle derived from an athematic stem), but at variance with the evidence of TB *yokänt-* 'drinker', the *-änt-* of which then would have to be an analogical innovation probably based on a 3.pl. form in pre-PT *-änti.[24]

---

[23] See already Peters, 2004a, 267, fn. 4, and Peters, 2006, 344, fn. 48 for explaining the palatalizing quality of the suffix allomorph PT *-'änt(')- in terms of a loc.sg. allomorph of the suffix PIE = (pre-PT?) *-ēnt, and see below against setting up the ending of the pre-PT loc.sg. as *-ēnti.

[24] This would be reminiscent of the situation with the Latin present participles: the thematic type *ferent-* evidently has *-ent-* < *-n̥t- analogically introduced from athematic participles such as *-sent-*; on the other hand, semithematic < athematic *eō* has *eunt-* probably based on the 3.pl. *eunt*.

36.2.4.2. *The origin of the palatal in -ñcā*

Since the palatalization of the consonant cluster *ñc* in the suffix *-ñcā* cannot be lautgesetzlich in the first place, one must assume that Tocharian B had secondarily distinguished the pure nomina agentis from the participles precisely by introducing palatalization into the participle, cf. Ringe, 1991, 96, fn. 85.

As for possible sources for this palatalization, Couvreur, 1947a, 28, § 45 assumed a blend of *-nt- with the nomen agentis suffix in *-ca* (/TA *-t*) as met in the type *kälpauca* 'one who obtains' (TA *kuryart* 'salesman'); however, in these forms *-c-* also has to be analogical in the first place. Note that nomina agentis in *-auca*, *-uca*, *-nta*, and *-(n)tsa* and participles in *-ñca* inflect in the same way:

	TB	TA
nom.sg.	*-ā*	*-ø*
voc.sg.	*-ai*	—
gen.sg.	*-āntse*	*-āp*
obl.sg.	*-ai*	*-āṃ*
nom.pl.m.	*-āñ*	*-āñ*
obl.pl.m	*-āṃ*	*-ās*
nom.pl.f	*-ānā*	*-āñ*
obl.pl.f.	—	*-ās*

Thomas, 1984, 216f. worked with a split of a formerly unpalatalized masculine and a palatalized feminine paradigm into true participles and nomina agentis. It is, however, more likely that PIE *-ntih$_2$ turned into TB (*)-*ntsā* for purely phonological reasons, independently from the etymology of *preṃtsa*, which Schmidt, 1975, 294f. derives from fem. PIE *bʰerontih$_2$, and to which Thomas, 1984, 216, fn. 15 objects.[25]

I think the most likely solution is to assume that both kinds of stem allomorph to be reconstructed for the PT case forms of the *nt*-participles other than the nom.sg., viz. *-nt- and *-nt'- > *-ñc-, had been inherited even into pre-TB, which then finally made its choices in order to keep the two historical categories formally distinct. The *-ca* met in the suffixes *-auca* and *-uca* is then best taken to have been transferred precisely from *-ñca*.

---

[25] It is indeed not quite certain whether the word means 'pregnant' in W 33 a 6 and 'potent' in S b 5 at all; very differently, Winter, 2001, 139 analyses the form as an adverb by the meaning "truly".

36.3. The *m*-Participle

The expected athematic suffix allomorph is PT *-ä-mānæ leading to TB (*)-*ämāne* and TA -*āmāṃ*, whereas the thematic allomorph is PT *-æ-mānæ leading to TB (*)-*emāne*, TA -*amāṃ*, and PT *-ā-mānæ in the present stems with A-character leading to TB (*)-*āmāne*, TA -*āmāṃ*.

The real distribution of these suffix allomorphs is, however, more complicated. In Tocharian A, TA -*amāṃ* and TA -*āmāṃ* are subject to vowel balance, i.e., TA *m*-participles made to stems containing a full vowel show syncope of the suffix vowel such as TA *tāsmāṃ* < *tāsamāṃ*.

In the athematic present Class I in Tocharian A only the suffix allomorph TA -*māṃ* is attested both from roots with non-full and with full root vocalism (e.g., TA *kälnmāṃ* from ᴬ*käln*- 'resound'; TA *kropmāṃ* from ᴬ*krop⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'gather', etc.). In Tocharian B, we have descriptively three suffix allomorphs: -*māne* (*träṅmane*, *nesmane*, *yumāne*, *smimane*), -*āmāne* (*nesamane*, *pkwamane*, *miwamane*, *yokamane*, *läṅkamane*, *tsipamane*), and thematized -*emāne* (in *ynemane*), but note that the stem *yn*- is exclusively attested in front of an -*e*-. Since *träṅmane* and *nesmane* are attested in metrical passages, they simply show the usual metrical loss of what seems accented *-á-, so that one must conclude that the suffix variant -*ámāne* is the regular variant.

In the thematic present Class II the expected and also only attested suffix allomorph is -*emāne* in Tocharian B. In Tocharian A, full-vowel stems also behave as expected, i.e., they always have TA -*māṃ* showing vowel balance. As for the non-full vowel roots, only TA *cämpamāṃ* and TA *ypamāṃ* show the expected preservation of the suffix TA -*a*- < PT *-æ-;[26] but TA *pärmāṃ*, TA *kälymāṃ* (just like 1.pl. TA *kälymār*), and TA *yärsmāṃ* show an unexpected loss of the thematic vowel. Winter, 1991, 51ff. = 2005, 428ff. claims different accent patterns to be responsible for the different outcomes of the suffix vowel (with quite a few analogical levelings). We may also be dealing with a kind of progressive, informal-style weakening of TA -*a*- to TA -*ä*-, as per Peters, 2006, 353, fn. 48, or just with analogical introduction from the roots with full root vocalism (which prevail in

---

[26] TA *mlamāṃ* rather belongs to a Prs III stem; see s.v. ᴬ*mäl⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'being crushed'.

this class). Finally, one should also think of the possibility that these cases might have preserved former athematic inflection.

In present Class III no variation is attested: Tocharian B always shows -*emāne*, and Tocharian A -*amāṃ*. In Class IV, Tocharian A always shows the expected syncope due to vowel balance, while Tocharian B has synchronically regular -*omāne.* In present Classes V and VI, we have -*(n)āmāne*, TA -*(n)āmāṃ* (TA -*(n)māṃ* after full root vowel), an exception is TA *kropnämāṃ* (metri causa, according to TG, 435) beside regular TA *kropnmāṃ*, i.e., we have here a reflex of *-ā- weakened to -*ä*- due to vowel balance that was *not* syncopated because of metrical requirements. The athematic present Class VII of TB shows both an athematic variant (*kutäṅkmane* from *kutk*[a]?- 'embody') and a secondary thematic variant (*piṅkemane* from *pik*[a]- 'paint'). As for Class VII of Tocharian A in -*ṅkā*-, this usually shows the expected suffix allomorph TA -*āmāṃ*, but we also have the variant TA *mläṅkmāṃ* (attested twice) from [A]*mälk*[a]- 'put together' that can be explained in two different ways (see chap. Prs VII 29.3.). In the *s(k)*- present classes Tocharian B shows thematic -*s(k)emane*; in contrast, Tocharian A has two different variants, owed to the fact that former presents in *-C-s- and *-C-äsk- were finally blended into one single paradigm. Actually, the expected match of -*s(k)emane*, i.e., TA -*samāṃ* is attested only in very few cases. Usually, we find the suffix allomorph TA -*äsmāṃ* (from the presents in *-C-äsk-) for both roots with non-full and full root vowel and with stems going back to both genuine *s*-presents and former *sk*-presents (*s*-present: TA *äläsmāṃ* from [A]*āl*[a]?- 'restrain', TA *trikäsmāṃ* from [A]*trik*[a]- Antigv. 'fail'; former *sk*-present: TA *kātkäsmāṃ* from [A]*kātk*- Kaus. I 'make glad', TA *śärsäsmāṃ* from [A]*kärs*[a]- Kaus. IV 'make know(n)', TA *pärskäsmāṃ* from [A]*pärsk*[a]- Kaus. I 'frighten'). TA -*samāṃ* is only found in TA *āksisamāṃ* (metrical beside TA *āksismāṃ*), TA *luksamāṃ* from [A]*luk*- Antigv./Kaus. II 'illuminate', TA *läntsamāntāp* (once attested beside a few attestations of TA *läntäsmāṃ*) from [A]*lä-n-t-* 'go out', and TA *ṣtämsamāṃ* from [A]*ṣtäm*[a]- Kaus. I 'put'. Syncope due to vowel balance is further found in TA *esmāṃ* from [A]*e*- 'give', TA *kosmāṃ* from [A]*ko*- 'kill', TA *wināsmāṃ* from [A]*win*[a]-*s*- 'honor', and TA *sesmāṃ* from [A]*se*- 'support'. In addition, we have irregular TA *wärsmāṃ* from [A]*wär*- 'practice', but here we may just be dealing with a metathesis of TA [†]*wräsmāṃ.* The same variation is found in Class X, but here (*)-*samāṃ* is far more common: TA *tmäṃsamāṃ* from [A]*täm*- 'be borne', TA *nkäṃsamāṃ* from [A]*näk*- 'fall into ruin', and with syncope

TA *päknāsmāṃ* from *ᴬpäkᵃ-* 'intend', TA *yomnāsmāṃ* from *ᴬyom⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'achieve', but TA *rinäsmāṃ* from *ᴬri(-n)-* 'leave' and TA *tsäknäsmāṃ* from *ᴬtsäk-* 'burn'.

The only attestation of a TA present Class XII *m*-participle shows an expected thematic allomorph (TA *tuṅkiññamāṃ*); no example is attested in Tocharian B.

36.4. SYNCHRONIC BEHAVIOR OF *nt*- AND *m*-PARTICIPLES

A statistical analysis with respect to *nt*- and *m*-participles reveals the following facts:

(1) In general, both languages behave similarly with respect to attestations of *nt*-participles and *m*-participles.

(2) The *nt*-participle is less common than the *m*-participle; in both languages the number of the *nt*-participles amounts to ca. one third of the *m*-participles.

(3) While the *m*-participle in both languages is common with both athematic and thematic stems, there is a significant difference with respect to *nt*-participles: in both languages, *nt*-participles from athematic stems (Classes I, V, VI, VII) are far less common than from thematic stems (Classes II, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII). Tocharian B is even more conspicuous in this respect than Tocharian A, because *nt*-participles made from athematic stems are almost non-existent in Tocharian B. The only *nt*-participle made from a Class I stem, viz. *yneñca* from *i-* 'go' is made from what rather looks like a thematic stem allomorph, viz. *yne-*, and the only TB *nt*-participle attested from a present of Class V is *śawāñca* from *śuwᵃ-*, which shows the full grade in the root and not the expected zero grade. An *nt*-participle from the nasal present Classes VI and VII in Tocharian B is unattested, a fact that cannot simply be dismissed as a coincidence, because present Class VI is attested very often.

(4) Classes III and IV clearly behave like the athematic classes in this respect. There is just one example of an *nt*-participle to be found in Class III in Tocharian B (*mäskeñca*),[27] and none in Class IV. It is slightly more common in Tocharian A, but still far less common than the *m*-participle. Note, however, that *nt*-participles are only rarely formed from intransitive present stems at all, so that this is a further synchronic reason not to expect *nt*-participles in the almost exclusively intransitive present Classes III and IV.

---

[27] Note that *mäskᵃ-* 'be' is, of course, a very frequent verb.

(5) The present participles are detached from voice in Tocharian, so that medium tantum or activum tantum verbs can respectively have *nt-* and *m-*present participles.

36.5. DIACHRONIC TREATMENT

There can be no doubt that the Tocharian *m-*participle is to be derived from the PIE participle continued by Vedic *-māna-*, Greek -μενος, etc., and the Tocharian participles and nomina agentis in *-nt-/* TB *-ñc-* from the PIE participle in *-nt-. As for the morphological details, TB final *-a* is best derived from PIE > pre-PT *-ōnt, and the palatalizing suffix variant PT *-'ænt(')-* of the thematic participles from locatival pre-PT *-ēnt, the original nucleus of which must have been participles derived from athematic root verbs (root presents or aorists); TB *-ñca* owes its palatal to pre-PT case forms of the original paradigm in *-nt- in which *-t- had to become palatalized in front of a following *e- or *i-vowel, such as the nom.pl. The fact that *nt-*participles are basically confined to the thematic present classes and that there are especially in Tocharian B hardly any *nt-*participles built from athematic stem formations (which even holds for so vivid and productive a present class as Class VI in *-nā-*) may have been caused by a synchronic feeling that the suffix of the *nt-*participle was of a palatalizing nature, which, of course, would have had to conflict with the rule that stem-final non-syllabics of athematic stems never get palatalized. Finally, it does not come as a huge surprise that the participles are synchronically built from present stems only, since this formation principle also holds for other non-finite forms of the verb, such as, e.g., the infinitive in Tocharian A. On the other hand, it does not strike as odd either that TA lexicalized agent nouns such as TA *pekant* 'painter' are rather built from what were synchronically subjunctive stems, since this alternative formation principle is also met with other non-finite verbal categories, e.g., with the infinitive of Tocharian B. Both TA *pekant* and the TB principle for infinitive formation can be taken for archaisms. Diachronically, all these peculiar subjunctive-based non-finite verbal forms can be accounted for if one is just willing to assume that the ancestors of all of the verbal stems that acted as subjunctive stems in PT and post-PT times had started out as *present* stems in pre-PT times.

THE IMPERATIVE

The manuals distinguish six different classes of imperatives (cf. WTG, 147, §§ 144-153; TEB 234ff., §§ 422-428):

> I. Suffixless imperatives belonging to a grundverb
> II. Suffixless imperatives belonging to a kausativum
> III. Imperatives with the suffix *-s-*
> IV. Imperatives with the suffix *-ṣṣ-*
> V. Imperatives with the *-ññ-*
> VI. Irregular formations

I will generally keep this classification. The sole exception is that I add another class, namely Class VII consisting of irregular imperatives, while in Class VI I only group together what I would like to call *e*-imperatives. Accordingly, I set up:

> Class I: *ā*-imperatives (generally made from the grundverb)
> Class II: Palatalized imperatives correlated with a (kausativum) preterit
>   of Class II
> Class III: *s*-imperatives
> Class IV: *sk*-imperatives
> Class V: *ññ*-imperatives
> Class VI: *e*-imperatives
> Class VII: Irregular formations

Imperative stems are independent verbal stems of their own. Nevertheless, almost every imperative class is synchronically associated with a preterit class. With very few exceptions, a Class I *ā*-imperative is accordingly associated with a Class I *ā*-preterit, a Class II imperative with a Class II preterit, a Class III *s*-imperative with a Class III *s*-preterit, a Class IV *sk*-imperative with a Class IV *ṣṣā*-preterit, and a Class V *ññ*-imperative with a Class V *ññā*-preterit. The Class VI *e*-imperative and the irregular formations are not correlated with a special preterit formation.

    Imperative forms are usually preceded by a particle PT *pä-, which is mandatory for any imperative form in Tocharian A, but can be absent in Tocharian B. Lack of *pä-* in Tocharian B is regular with verbs beginning with *p-* (which is surely due to simplification of **pä-p-* > **pp-* > *p-*), with the two exceptions *pepīltso* 'listen!' and *peplyaṅke*

'sell!'; lack of the particle is especially often attested in the eastern variety of Tocharian B; see Ringe, 1989, 51ff., and most recently Peyrot, 2008, 62.[1]

37.1. THE *ā*-IMPERATIVE — CLASS I

The following 39 verbs form an imperative of Class I (28 TB, 27 TA, 16 TB = TA):

^{A}*ārt^a*- 'love, praise', *ās*- 'bring, fetch', *kāk^a*-/ ^{A}*kāk^a*- 'call', ^{A}*kām^a*- 'carry, take', *kärs$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*kärs$^{(a)}$*- 'know', *kärs$^{(a)}$*- Kaus. IV 'make, let know(n)', *kärst^a*- 'cut off', *käl^a*-/ ^{A}*käl^a*- 'lead, bring', *käsk$^{(a)}$*- 'scatter', ^{A}*krop$^{(a)}$*- 'gather', *klāp^a*- ± touch; investigate', *klautk$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*lotk^a*- 'turn, become', *tāk^a*-/ ^{A}*tāk$^{(a)}$*- 'be, become', *tāw$^{a?}$*- '?', *tās*- 'put', ^{A}*täps*- 'destroy', *tärk^a*-/ ^{A}*tärk^a*- 'dismiss, emit', *pāsk*-/ ^{A}*pās*- 'protect', *pärk^a*- '(a)rise', *pälk^a*-/ ^{A}*pälk^a*- 'see', *pälsk^a*-/ ^{A}*päl(t)sk^a*- 'consider, think', *prutk$^{(a)}$*- Kaus. I 'shut; fill', ^{A}*mrosk$^{(a)}$*- 'feel disgust', *rit^a*-/ ^{A}*rit^a*- 'seek', *ritt$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*ritw$^{(a)}$*- 'be attached', *läk$^{(a)}$*- 'see', *läm$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*läm$^{(a)}$*- 'sit', ^{A}*lu?*- 'rub', *lu^a*-/ ^{A}*lu^a*- 'send', *wāy^a*- 'lead', *wärp^a*-/ ^{A}*wärp^a*- 'feel, enjoy', *wik$^{(a)}$*- 'disappear', *wlāw^a*- 'control', ^{A}*wles*- 'perform', ^{A}*sām$^{a?}$*- 'gather' *sāmp$^{(a)}$*-/ ^{A}*sum^a*- 'take away, *skāy^a*-/ ^{A}*skāy^a*- 'strive', ^{A}*ṣtäm$^{(a)}$*- 'stand', ^{A}*tsäk$^{(a)}$*- 'pull out', ^{A}*tsuk^a*- 'drink'.

The following Ipv I forms are attested in Tocharian B:

2.SG.ACT.: *pāsa, pokkāka/pkāka, pkārsa, pkrāsta, pkāla, päklautka, ptāka/tāka, ptārka/tārka, pālka, plāska, pälyaka-me, plāma, plāwa, päskāya/skāya*; 2.PL.ACT.: *pokkākas, pkarsas/pkarsaso/ pkärso, pkarstas, kalas, ptarkaso, ptāwas, palkas(o), palskaso, prittāso, plamās-ñ/lämās, pluwas, pwīkaso, päskāyas/skāyas*; 2.SG.MID.: *karsar, pkalar, pkaskar-ñ* (MQ), *päklapar* (MQ), *parkar, palkar, prutkar, prītar, pärrittar/rīttar, pwāyar-me, purwar, psāmpar*;

---

[1] The particle is generally assumed to be a cognate of the Slavic prefix *po*, which was first proposed by Meillet in Lévi/Meillet, 1912, 18. Meillet stated that the Tocharian imperative particle precisely like the Slavic one originally had a perfective meaning, which tallies with the fact that in Slavic the imperative is generally based on the perfective aspect stem, whereas the prohibitive is based on the imperfective stem. In contrast, Ringe, 1991, 97f. objects to the connection of the Slavic form with the Tocharian imperative particle for phonological reasons. Van Brock, 1978, 227ff. wanted to explain *pä*- directly from PIE *po*-, on the basis of the assumption of a sound law PT *æ > *ä in unstressed syllables, cf. Pinault, 2008, 606. Hackstein, 2001, 17f. assumes that Tocharian made use of two PIE variants, *pe > PT *pä > TB/TA *pä* and PIE *po > PT *pæ > TA *pa*, TB *po.* Note that the frequently used Ipv forms of *klyaus*- 'listen' show an irregular, i.e., progressive reduction of the particle *pä*- to *p*- before *kl(y)-: pklauṣ* (S) beside *päklyauṣ* and *pklyausso* (S) beside *päklyausso*, which implies a syllabification of the type *-V.TR- that is also met in *śtwer*, etc. 'four'.

2.PL.MID.: *pasāt, pkalat, pättāsat, pāṣṣat, prītat, pärīttat, purwat/pūrpat, pulāwat.*

The following Ipv I forms are attested in Tocharian A:

2.SG.ACT.: *päkras, päṣtāk/päṣtāk-ñi, ptark, plotäk, päṣtam, ptsok*; 2.PL.ACT.: *pu̯kāks-äṃ, pkärsäs, pṣtākäs/päṣtākäs, ptäpsäs, ptärkäs, pritwäs, pälmäs/ plamäs, plos, päskāyäs, päṣtmäs*; 2.SG.MID.: *pārtār, pkāmār, päklār, päkropār, ppāṣār, pälkār, ppälskār, pämroskār, pritār, pälwār, purpar/pūrpar, pleṣār, psāmār, psumār*; 2.PL.MID.: *(pu̯kkā)kāc, pkāmāc, ppāṣāc, pälkāc, purpāc/ pūrpāc, pätskāc.*

The *ā*-imperative shows clear cases of root ablaut between the 2. singular active on the one hand and the 2. plural active and the middle on the other hand in both languages. In ablauting paradigms the 2.sg. active regularly has the æ-grade in the root leading to TB -*ā*- via *ā*-umlaut caused by the 2.sg.act. ending -*ā*. The corresponding forms in Tocharian A have the root vowel TA -*a*- which is likewise the regular outcome of PT *-æ-. As for the lack of *ā*-umlaut, according to the rule by Cowgill, 1967, 176f. = 2006, 448f. that *ā*-umlaut did not affect accented *-ǽ- in Tocharian A, one would indeed not expect *ā*-umlaut to have occurred in these forms (but see my objections to Cowgill's views on *ā*-umlaut in chap. Sound Laws 1.5.). To be sure, at first glance it seems that Tocharian A did not have a pre-TA ending *-ā in the 2.sg. active at all. The evidence for that comes from a form constructed with enclitic pronoun TA *päṣtāk-ñi* in A 221 a 2: *(mā) klopasu päṣtāk-ñi* "don't be miserable!" (my restoration); with respect to the meter it is impossible to add another syllable to the pāda.[2] It hence seems we have to posit a pre-TA ending *-ä in the 2.sg. active differing from TB -*ā* at least in this form (and going well together with the TA 2. plural active ending -*äs*, which, strangely enough, points to pre-TA *-äsV). However, since a stem-final *-ä is diachronically unexpected and since I cannot conceive of any analogical process that could have turned former stem-final *-ā- into *-ä- in the imperative, I suggest that the verbum substantivum form TA *päṣtāk* merely shows a more progressive sound change, i.e., an irregular weakening of stem-final *-ā- to -*ä*-, because such a more progressive phonological shape can be observed with other forms of the verbum substantivum as well.[3] This assumption would avoid having to set up a perfectly

---

[2] TA *ñi* cannot be the genitive of the independent variant of the pronoun, because this would not make sense syntactically.

[3] Cf., e.g., the irregular loss of -*ā*- in the 1.pl. TA Pt I *tākmäs* from the very same root ᴬ*tāk*ᵃ- 'be, become' (cf. TEB I, 47, § 11,3c, fn. 3).

expected stem-final *-ā(-)* for Tocharian B, but an entirely unexpected *-ä-* for Tocharian A; note furthermore TA *pkanā-ñi* from a highly irregular stem *kākænā-.

Quite remarkably, from a synchronic point of view the root vowel of the 2.sg. active Ipv I in Tocharian A is always the same as the one of the respective *ā*-preterit active *plural* stem. In contrast, in Tocharian B the 2.sg. active imperative shows a stem different from the corresponding ablauting *ā*-preterit, cf. 2.sg.act. Ipv I *pkāla* 'bring!' beside the palatalized 3.sg.act. Pt I *śala*, 3.pl.act. *śilāre*, 3.sg.mid. *klāte* from *käl^ä-* 'lead, bring'. There are only two 2.sg. active forms of TB *ā*-imperatives listed in the manuals that show unexpected *ä*-grade in the root: *pätrīwa-ne* 'mix it!' and *pälyaka-me* 'let us see!'. As for the latter form, it is highly irregular; see in the verbal index s.v. *läk^(ä)-*, and it cannot be ruled out that we have to start with a middle *pälyaka<r>-me* showing loss of final *-r* in an informal-style formation in the first place. Final *r*-loss cannot be ruled out for *pätrīwa-ne* either, but since this form from a semantic point of view belongs to the kausativum and can also be analyzed as a regular 2.sg.act. Class II imperative, which is the expected class for a form belonging to a kausativum paradigm, I analyze it as such an Ipv II.

As for the 2.pl. active Ipv I forms, both Tocharian A and B show non-palatalizing (*)-*ä*- as root vowel in ablauting roots, cf., e.g., *ptarkaso*, TA *ptärkäs* from ^A*tärk^ä-* 'emit'. As for the ending, for morphological reasons one would, of course, expect PT *-*āsV* and not *-*äsV*, and PT *-*āsV* is indeed the ending of the 2.pl. active of the *ā*-preterit. Now, whereas Tocharian A clearly has precisely such a strange Ipv ending *-*äsV*, there is not a single attestation of an Ipv ending variant *-äs* in Tocharian B, which should at least show up in MQ texts. On the other hand, we have many attestation of what seems a mobile *-o* reflecting final *-*ä* from a PT *-*āsä* instead: *pkarsaso*, *ptarkaso*, *palskaso*, *prittāso*, *pwīkaso*, and it has to be pointed out that the attestations of that *-o* are not confined to metrical texts. The 2.pl. *ptarkaso* is certainly attested in a prose passage in 79, 1 (a text from Šorčuq); note also *pkärso* (MQ) in 284 b 7, which cannot simply be due to haplography, because the meter requires a disyllabic form (cf. TochSprR(B), s.v.) that could have perfectly well be achieved by a form without *o* mobile. I guess that the apparently sprachwirklich syncope of *pkärsāso* to *pkärso* was due to a progressive phonological development one encounters now and then precisely in imperative forms.

Hence, descriptively we have to do with two different variants of the ending, one in *-s(ä)* and another one in *-so*; note that the same has to be said of the TB allative suffix (see Malzahn, 2007a, 283, fn. 38 with ref.). In the corresponding *ā*-preterit the 2.pl. active is more often attested without *-o*, and it is not entirely clear whether the attestations of *-o* in the preterit are confined to metrical passages or whether *-o* in the preterit can likewise show up in prose passages (see chap. Endings 3.3.1.5.). To be sure, the accent of the preterit forms without *-o* lies on the second syllable, thereby still attesting to a former trisyllabic structure (*takās*). As for 2.pl.act. imperative forms without *-o*, *lämās* (S) has the accent of a form without prefixed **pä-*, and *kalas* (much like 2.sg.mid. *karsar*, *rīttar*) that of one with **pä-*. In Tocharian A, the variant of the 2.pl.act. Ipv TA *plamäs* 'sit!' attested with certainty in YQ 27 b 5 found beside the regular 2.pl.act. TA *pälmäs* attested in A 274 a 4, seems to have introduced the æ-grade that is expected to have shown up in the 2.sg.act. **plam*.

As for the middle endings, there are no forms with mobile *-o* attested. The 2.pl.mid. *pasāt* (found twice in a text from Sängim) attests to a former trisyllabic **pāsā́tä*.[4] Note that there is no vowel balance in the TA *ā*-imperative (cf. TEB I, 45, § 11,2, fn. 1); for a convincing explanation, see Winter, 1994, 405f. = 2005, 454f.

The regular ablaut grade of the *ā*-imperative middle in ablauting paradigms is non-palatalizing *ä*.

As for Proto-Tocharian, one has to set up an ablauting kind of *ā*-imperative with non-palatalizing **æ* in the 2.sg. active, and non-palatalizing **ä* in the 2.pl. active and in the middle. More difficult to reconstruct are the endings. The ending set **-ā*, **-āsä/å* showing up in Tocharian B is expected, whereas at least 2.pl. **-äsV* as preform of Tocharian A is highly suspicious, the more since the corresponding preterit ending is indeed TA *-ās*. If TA *päṣtāk-ñi* is merely a special case of weakening (an explanation I prefer), we have a strange paradigm **-ā*, **-äsV*. Note that the very same paradigm **-ā*, **-äsV* is actually attested in most of the other imperative classes (i.e., Classes II, III, and V), so one may toy with the idea of a simple analogy (as has

---

[4] *pasāt* is remarkable for another reason: roots without A-character, i.e., those with a thematic subjunctive (Class II) forming an *ā*-preterit have a palatalized root-final in the preterit and in the middle of the corresponding *ā*-imperative. The root *ās-* has a Sub II, but there is no preterit from this root attested, the stem serves as suppletive imperative to *pär-* 'carry' (present tantum) and *kām^ä-* 'carry' (only Pt and PPt). See also the diachronic discussion below 37.7.2., fn. 14.

been argued by Adams, 1988a, 103, fn. 55). A bit problematic is the fact that the stem-final *-ā in these classes must have been taken over from the *ā*-imperative in the first place; see below the more detailed discussion in 37.8.

37.2.   THE IMPERATIVE OF CLASS II

The following 14 verbs form an imperative of Class II (11 TB, 7 TA, 4 TB = TA):

^A*kärs*(ā)- Kaus. IV 'make know(n), teach', ^A*käl*- 'bear, endure', *käl*ᵃ- Kaus. IV 'let lead', *täp*- 'proclaim', *tuk*(ā)- Kaus. I 'hide', *triw*(ā)- Kaus. I 'mix', *närk*- 'keep away', *yät*(ā)- Kaus. I 'adorn', ^A*yär*(ā)- Kaus. I 'bathe', *wätk*(ā)- Kaus. II/ ^A*wätk*(ā)- Kaus. II 'command', *wär*-/ ^A*wär*- 'practice', *wik*(ā)- Kaus. II/ ^A*wik*(ā)- Kaus. II 'drive away', *stäm*(ā)- Kaus. I/ ^A*ṣtäm*(ā)- Kaus. I 'put, place', *tsälp*(ā)- Kaus. I 'redeem'.

The following Ipv II forms are attested in Tocharian B:

2.SG.ACT.: *päccapa*, *päccauk*, *pätrīwa-ne*, *pīta*, *pitka*, *pika*, *päścama*; 2.PL.ACT.: *päñarkas*, *pitkaso*; 2.SG.MID.: *pśīmar*, *pätsilpar-ñ*; 2.PL.MID.: *śālāt*, *pīrat*, *pikāt* (MQ).

The following Ipv II forms are attested in Tocharian A:

2.SG.ACT.: *pśärs*, *pkäl*, *putäk/pūtkā-ñi*, *pwikā-m*, *päśśäm*; 2.PL.ACT.: —; 2.SG.MID.: *päyrār*; 2.PL.MID.: *purāc*, *päśmāc*.

Note the following phonological developments: *pīta* < päy'ätā (from *yät*(ā)- Kaus. I 'adorn'), *pitka* < *päw'ätkā (from *wätk*(ā)- Kaus. II 'command'), *pīrat* < *päw'ärā- (from *wär*- 'practice'), *pikāt* < *päw'äykā (from *wik*(ā)- Kaus. II 'drive away'), *pśīmar* < *päścämār (from *stäm*(ā)- Kaus. I 'put'), TA *putäk* < *pä-w'ätkā (from ^A*wätk*(ā)- Kaus. II 'command'), TA *purāc* < *pä-w'ärā- (from ^A*wär*- 'practice').

    The Class II imperative is normally correlated with a respective preterit of Class II, although the finite Pt II forms look quite different in Tocharian A and B with respect to each other and with respect to the imperative forms. Usually, we have to do with *ä*-grade in the root in all persons and palatalization of the root initial if that of the respective Pt II is also palatalized, as in the cases of 2.sg.act. Ipv TA *pśärs* 'make know!' beside 3.sg.act. Pt TA *śaśärs* 'made know', but 2.sg.act. Ipv TA *pkäl* 'bear!' beside 3.sg.act. Pt TA *kakäl* 'bore'. The same is true for Tocharian B, where forms like *pśīmar* 'put!' < *päścämār from *stäm*(ā)-, not †*päścāmār* (cf. 2.sg.mid. Pt *ścāmātai*) clearly show that the ablaut of the Class II imperative is independent

of that of the corresponding Class II preterit. The sole exceptions from *ä*-grade are 2.sg.act. *päccauk* 'hide!' and 2.pl.mid. *śalāt*.[5] The 2.sg.act. *päccauk* is also irregular for another reason, because it shows loss of the ending. TEB I, 235, § 424 states that the loss of the ending *-ā* is regular after full vowel in the root syllable, which is not contradicted by the facts at least in this imperative class. However, since *päccauk* is attested in a business letter, one can also assume an informal-style variant, because in the other categories of Tocharian B there is no loss and preservation of word-final *-ā* depending on the vocalism of the preceding syllable. In Tocharian A, the only imperative showing a full (and non-palatalizing) vowel in the root and standing beside a preterit of Class II is the 2.sg.act. Ipv TA *pkanā-ñi* 'fulfill for me!' from *Akän*-Kaus. I 'fulfill'.[6]

Roots forming a preterit of Class II in Tocharian B with an initial consonant that lacks a primary palatal variant but can have what looks like a secondary palatalized root-initial (such as *my*, etc.) show a remarkable behavior with respect to the corresponding imperative: *mäsk-* '(ex)change' with 3.sg. Pt II *myāska* does not form a corresponding Class II imperative, but one of Class IV instead, i.e., 2.sg.mid. *maskässar*; the same is true for *tsälp*@- 'redeem, free' that has 3.sg.mid. Pt II *tsyalpāte*, but Ipv IV 2.sg.mid. *tsalpässar-me*. It can further not be a coincidence that both these Ipv IV forms are attested in texts of eastern provenance: *maskässar* in 417 b 3 (M) and *tsalpässar-me* in 108 a 9 (S), so that I claim that the formation of Ipv IV from such roots with Pt II that did not have root initials for which a primary palatal was available is a secondary, informal-style feature. This theory can be backed up by another transitive imperative form attested from *tsälp*@- 'redeem, free', i.e., the 2.sg.mid. Ipv *pätsilpar-ñ* attested in the MQ text 283 a 3. The manuals analyze this form as a grundverb *ā*-imperative with transitive meaning, and though there are indeed very few examples of that kind of transitive *ā*-imperatives, I like to analyze *pätsilpar-ñ* in a different way: The *i*-vowel in the root

---

[5] The 2.pl.mid. *śalāt* is attested without further context in 575 a 7, so that one can have doubts whether we are dealing with an imperative at all; however, judging by the general context, one has to consent to Krause's view "kaum Pt." (WTG, 233). To be sure, an imperative of the 2. plural would be backed up by likewise forms in the preceding and following sentence; one may even restore to *(pä)śalāt*, but not to *(p)śalāt*, because there is no trace of a ⟨p⟩ above the ⟨śā⟩.

[6] The Pt II made from this root behaves indeed entirely irregularly in both languages; see chap. Pt II.

of *pätsilpar-ñ* points strongly to a palatalized environment, i.e., *pätsilpar-ñ* is to be analyzed as a Class II imperative **päts'älpār* in the first place, and not as a Class I form. Consequently, I suggest that the above discussed *sk*-imperatives of Class IV are innovations of the more progressive eastern variety and also of Tocharian A (see below on Class IV in detail), whereas *pätsilpar-ñ* is an archaism of the older language.

37.3. THE *s*-IMPERATIVE — CLASS III

The following 19 verbs form an imperative of Class III (16 TB, 11 TA, 8 TB = TA):

eṅk-/ (*ᴬemts⁽ä⁾-*) 'seize', *er-/* *ᴬar-* 'evoke', *au-n-/* *ᴬo-(n-)* 'hit, begin', *ᴬkän-* Kaus. I 'fulfill', *käm-/* *ᴬkum-* 'come', *käl-* 'bear', *tās-/* *ᴬtā(-s)-* 'put', *pärk-/* *ᴬpärk-* 'ask', *päl-* 'listen closely', *plāk-* act. 'agree', mid. 'ask for permission', *yām-/* *ᴬyām-* 'do', *yäp-* 'enter, set', *yärp-* 'take care', *ri-n-/* *ᴬri(-n)-* 'leave', *läṅk-* Antigv. 'let dangle', *ᴬwär-* 'smell', *ᴬwäs-* 'put on, don', *wik⁽ä⁾-* Antigv. 'avoid', *sai-n-/* *ᴬse-* 'rely on, support'.

The following Ipv III forms are attested in Tocharian B:

2.SG.ACT.: *peṅksa/peṅsa, pauṃ, kamp, pkel, ptes/ptesä/tes, pyām, pyop*; 2.PL.ACT.: *kamtso, ptässo* (MQ), *pepīltso, pyāmtso, pirpso, plaṅso-ne, pwikso*; 2.SG.MID.: *peṅsar, persar, ptäsar* (MQ), *plāksar, pyāmtsar, printsar/pritsar, plyatstsar-me* (S, sic), *psainar*; 2.PL.MID.: *peṅksat, persat, pauntsat, parksat, pyāmtsat*; 2.DU.: *pyamttsait* (MQ).

The following Ipv III forms are attested in Tocharian A:

2.SG.ACT.: *pkanā-ñi, ptas, pyām/pyāmä-m*; 2.PL.ACT.: *pukmäs, pyāmäs*; 2.SG.MID.: *parsār,* (*peṃtsār,*) *pätstsār, ppärksār, pyāmtsār, pursār, pusār-ñi, psesār*; 2.PL.MID.: *parsāc,* (*pentsāc,*) *posāc, pätstsāc, ppärksāc, pyāmtsāc, prisāc, psesāc-ñi.*

In Tocharian B, the *s*-imperative is always correlated with an *s*-preterit; in Tocharian A, one form that looks like an Ipv III has a Class II preterit beside it (*ᴬkän-* Kaus. I 'fulfill'), and one Ipv III has a preterit participle made from a Class IV preterit stem beside it (*ᴬwär-* 'smell'). The ablaut grade of the forms of the *s*-imperative in Tocharian B always corresponds to that of the respective *s*-preterit, i.e., if the *s*-preterit shows inner-paradigmatic ablaut, the *s*-imperative also does: *æ*-grade in the 2.sg. active, and *ä*-grade in the 2.pl. active and in the middle, cf. from *tās-* 'put' Pt III 3.sg.act. *tessa*, 3.sg.mid. *tässāte*, beside Ipv III 2.sg.act. *ptes*, 2.pl.act. *ptässo*, 2.sg.mid. *ptäsar*. In Tocharian A, there is only one ablauting *s*-imperative attested, which is also made

from ᴬtā(-s)- 'put': 2.sg.act. TA *ptas*, 2.sg.mid. *pätstsār* also showing æ-grade in the 2.sg. active, but *ä*-grade in the middle (no 2.pl. active is attested); the corresponding *s*-preterit differs at least in the active: Pt 3.sg.act. TA *casäs*, 3.sg.mid. TA *tsāte*.

The 2.sg. active of the *s*-imperative in Tocharian B is usually endingless: *kamp* (sic, for **pkam*, as per Winter, 1984a, 119 = 2005, 264), *pauṃ* in H add.149 87 a 8 (as per M. Peyrot, p.c.), *pkel*, *ptes/tes*, *pyām*, *pyop*; note disyllabic *ptesä* in 295 b 3 (metrically backed up, attested in pāda-final position, MQ text with common archaic ductus) that preserves the former ending (*)-*ä*. However, there are no variants attested with mobile -*o*. There is only one form showing an ending TB **-sā*, i.e., *peṅksa*, which is attested a couple of times. Since this Ipv *peṅksa* would be both the only 2.sg.act. Ipv III with an *s*-morpheme and the only active form attested from the respective root at all (Tocharian A included), it is quite obvious that we are in fact dealing with a 2.sg. middle **peṅksar* that was simplified by loss of -*r* (for a possible parallel reduction of -*r*, see Peters, 2004, 442). In pre-Tocharian A, however, the 2.sg.act. had an ending **-ā* to judge by the attested forms followed by enclitic pronouns. There is no syncope of the ending -*ā* in TA *pkanā-ñi* and TA *pyāmā-m* for the reasons given by Winter, 1994, 405f. = 2005, 454f.

In the TB 2. plural active there are only forms attested with what looks like a mobile -*o*. The only exception would be a 2.pl active *pyopäs* 'let us enter', but this form cited in the manuals is only based on a restoration in 375 b 4 by TochSprR(B): *(pyo)päs ostuwane* "let us (enter) the house"; since there are no parallel 2.pl. active forms in -*äs* made from the *s*-imperative, I would rather not support that restoration. Like the -*o* in the ending of the 2.pl. active of the *ā*-imperative, -*o* in Ipv III is attested in prose passages from texts of all provenances as well. However, unlike the 2.pl.act. of the *ā*-imperative, that of the *s*-imperative even only seems to have forms in -*o*, because there is no (certain) attestation without it. In the corresponding *s*-preterit there is one attestation without -*o* (*maitas*), and one attestation with -*o* (*lautso*) in the MQ text 431 b 2 in what looks like a prose passage as well. Hence, -*o* seems to have been common in the Pt III as well. Of course, there is again no weakening by vowel balance in Tocharian A.

Similarly to the *ā*-imperative, the *s*-imperative in Proto-Tocharian had non-palatalizing PT **æ* in the root in the 2.sg. active only, and non-palatalizing PT **ä* in the 2.pl. active and in the middle. And just like in the case of the *ā*-imperative, the active endings of the two

languages differ: Tocharian B points to an ending set *-ä, pl. *-äså,
Tocharian A to *-ā, -äsV.

37.4.   THE *sk*-IMPERATIVE — CLASS IV

The following twelve verbs form an *sk*-imperative (10 TB, 2 TA):

au-n- Kaus. IV 'cause to begin', *Aen-* 'punish', *kātk-* Kaus. I 'make glad', *kätk(a)-*
Kaus. IV 'let pass', *klautk(a)-* Kaus. I 'make turn', *plānt(a)-* Kaus. I 'make glad',
mäsk- '(ex)change', *läk(a)-* Kaus. IV 'make see, show', *Aläm(a)-* Kaus. I 'set', *stinā-*
sk- Kaus. I 'make silent', *tsārw(a)-* Kaus. I 'comfort', *tsälp(a)-* Kaus. I 'redeem,
free'.

The following Ipv IV forms are attested in Tocharian B:

2.SG.ACT.:   —; 2.PL.ACT.: *plakäskes*; 2.SG.MID.: *ponäṣṣar*, *kätkäṣṣar* (sic),
plāntaṣar-me (sic), *maskäṣṣar*, *pstināṣṣar*, *tsalpäṣṣar-me*; 2.PL.MID.: *pkātkäṣṣat*,
päklautkäṣṣat, *ptsārwaṣṣat-ne* (sic).

The following Ipv IV forms are attested in Tocharian A:

2.SG.ACT.: —; 2.PL.ACT.: —; 2.SG.MID.: *pemṣār*, *pälmāṣār*; 2.PL.MID.: — .

One would expect that the *sk*-imperative is correlated with a
respective *ṣṣā*-preterit of Class IV, which, in turn, is correlated with an
sk-present/subjunctive. However, in Tocharian B imperatives of Class
IV often have a preterit of Class II beside them, which is not
problematic from a functional point of view, because both Class II and
Class IV preterits serve as productive preterit stems of the
kausativum. The absolute figures are not too high, however.
Correlation of Ipv IV with Pt IV is found with three roots: *kātk-* Kaus.
I 'make glad' Pt IV in PPt *kakātkäṣṣu*, Ipv IV 2.sg.mid. *pkātkäṣṣat*;
läk(a)- Kaus. IV 'make see, show' Pt IV 3.sg.act. *lakäṣṣa-me*, Ipv IV
2.pl.act. *plakäskes*; *tsārw(a)-* Kaus. I 'comfort, console' Pt IV 3.sg.mid.
tsārwäṣṣate, Ipv IV 2.pl.mid. *ptsārwaṣṣat-ne*; on the other hand,
correlation of Ipv IV with Pt II is likewise found with three roots:
kätk(a)- Kaus. IV 'let pass, cross' Pt II 2.sg.act. *śātkasta*, Ipv IV 2.sg.mid.
kätkäṣṣar (sic); *mäsk-* '(ex)change' Pt II 3.sg.act. *myāska*, Ipv IV
2.pl.mid. *maskäṣṣar*; *tsälp(a)-* Kaus. I 'redeem, free' Pt II 3.sg.act.
tsyālpāte, Ipv IV 2.sg.mid. *tsalpäṣṣar-me*. The only TA Ipv IV beside
which a preterit stem is attested at all is *Aläm(a)-* Kaus. I 'set, let sit' (Ipv
IV 2.pl.mid. *pälmaṣār*), which shows a Pt II 3.sg.act. TA *lyalymā-ṃ.* In
Tocharian B, all Class IV imperatives standing beside a Class II
preterit are further confined to texts of eastern provenance: *kätkäṣṣar*
in 296 b 4 (D), *maskäṣṣar* in 417 b 3 (M), and *tsalpäṣṣar-me* in 108 a 9

(S). This cannot be a coincidence, the more since for *tsälp⁽ᵃ⁾*- there is also a Class II imperative variant attested in an older MQ text. The fact that also the sole TA example shows correlation between Pt II and Ipv IV also fits the general picture that the eastern variety of Tocharian B and Tocharian A have a couple of common features that seem to have developed in close contact with each other (see Malzahn, 2007a, 289ff.). It may also be no chance that the pairing of Pt II and Ipv IV involves precisely two roots that have a secondarily palatalized root initial *my-* and *tsy-* in the Class II preterit in Tocharian B. Since except in the 2.sg. active the imperative forms of Class II differed from that of Class I merely with respect to root-initial palatalization, the speakers of the eastern variety of Tocharian B and of Tocharian A may have felt the need to mark the imperative of the kausativum more strongly, and this may also have been the reason for the middle inflection of *kätkäṣṣar*, *maskäṣṣar*, and *tsalpäṣṣar-me*. As for the rest of the middle imperatives of Class IV — which somewhat surprisingly prevail in this class —, the Class IV preterit of *tsārw⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. I is medium tantum, so we would not expect an active imperative at all; beside the active Pt IV of *läk⁽ᵃ⁾*- Kaus. IV there is exactly the one single active Ipv IV 2.pl. *plakäskes* attested. The other attestations of imperative middles from Class IV do not have finite preterit forms beside them.

The 2.pl. active *plakäskes* now attested in PK AS 17D a 5 (and consequently not yet listed in the manuals) is very important for the background of the class, because it shows the ending *-es* of the *e*-imperative, and, what is more, the non-palatalized *sk*-suffix allomorph, whereas the corresponding preterit of Class IV never shows the non-palatalized *sk*-suffix allomorph. See the diachronic discussion below in 37.8.

37.5.   THE *ññ*-IMPERATIVE — CLASS V

The following four verbs form a *ññ*-imperative (3 TB, 2 TA, 1 TB = TA):

ᴬāks- 'announce', *ārc(-äññ)*- 'should', *tänkwä-ññ*- 'love', *we-ñ-/ ᴬwe-ñ*- 'say'.

The following Ipv V forms are attested in Tocharian B:

2.SG.ACT.: *poñ* (MQ, Š), *poñä* (MQ),[7] *ptäṅwäññe* (MQ); 2.PL.ACT.: *poñes* (S)/*pontso* (Š); 2.SG.MID.: *porcaññar*; 2.PL.MID.: — .

---

[7] Attested in pāda-final position in the MQ-character text IOL Toch 80 a 5 (archaic ductus).

The following Ipv V forms are attested in Tocharian A:

2.SG.ACT.: *peṃ*, *pākṣiñ/pākṣiññā-ñi*; 2.PL.ACT.: *penäs*; 2.SG.MID.: —; 2.PL.MID.: —.

Quite expectedly, it is Class V preterits (and Class XII presents and subjunctives) that go together with these imperatives. The root *ᴬᴮweñ-* 'say' belongs here as well, because one evidently has to set up a PT subjunctive < present stem *wæññ-; see chap. Sub VII 22.2.3.1.

It is remarkable that the ten attested forms show many variants with respect to the endings. We have endingless *poñ* beside an ending *-ññe* in the 2.sg.act. *ptäṅwäññe*, and *poñes* beside *pontso* in the 2.pl. active, *poñes* being attested once in an eastern text, *pontso* once in a central text, which tallies with the fact that also in the bare *e*-imperative ending *-so* shows up in MQ and central texts and *-es* precisely in eastern ones. Word-final (*)-*ā*(-) in the TA 2.sg.act. is certainly an innovation: see the diachronic discussion below. For the phonological development 2.sg. *poñ* < *pä-wæññ°, see Þórhallsdóttir, 1988, 201; Ringe, 1989a, 38; 1996, 155, § 64 with ref. The 2.sg.act. TA *peṃ* shows *-Vññ- > *-Vyññ- typical of Tocharian A, and the expected degemination and depalatization of word-final *-ññ (see, e.g., Hilmarsson, 1991a, 106 and 111); the resulting stem allomorph *pen-* with non-palatalized nasal has been analogically introduced into the 2.pl.act. TA *penäs*; see Winter, 1977, 154, = 1984, 199 = 2005, 191 (*äwæ obviously leading to *o* in Tocharian A as well; see Ringe, 1989a, 44, fn. 19). The 2.sg.act. TA *pākṣiñ* from *ᴬāks-* (attested in A 54 b 5 before a word beginning with *g-*) shows analogical introduction of the palatal *-ñ-*, no doubt because the imperative of this root was used quite frequently, and is indeed actually more often attested with enclitic pronoun, hence with *-ññ-* in non-final context (now also attested in THT 1143 a 4).

37.6.   THE *e*-IMPERATIVE — CLASS VI

The following four TB verbs form a bare *e*-imperative: *āks-* 'announce', *täl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'carry, bear', *pläṅk⁽ᵃ⁾-* Antigv. 'sell', *yärp-* 'take care'; furthermore, there are also the suppletive imperative forms of *ai-* 'give' ending in *-e* and *-es*, respectively, and some forms in *-e* and *-es* already mentioned among the Class IV and V imperatives (*plakäskes*, *ptäṅwäññe*, *poñes*). Here probably also belongs: *śāw-* 'live' (see s.v. *śāw-* 'live').

The following forms are actually attested:

2.SG.ACT.: *pete*, *pokse* (M, Š), *ptälle-ñ* (MQ), *peplyaṅke*, *pīrpe* (MQ); *pśāy(e)*;
2.PL.ACT.: *petes* (S)/*petso* (Š),[8] *pokses* (S); *pśaiso* (Š); 2.SG.MID.: —; 2.PL.MID.: —.

The *e*-imperative is only attested in Tocharian B (a final PT *-æ is, of course, lost in TA in absolute final context, but could have been preserved with enclitic pronouns), but it can hardly be an inner-TB innovation: see the diachronic discussion below. TA *paṣ*, the TA equivalent of TB *pete* 'give!', is highly irregular as well (see Hackstein, 2001, 30f.), and both forms are opaque from a synchronic point of view.[9] The equivalent of *pokse* 'say!' in Tocharian A is a more complex Ipv V TA *pākṣiñ*; TA equivalents of the other three forms are not attested at all. Beside *pīrpe* there exists also the 2.pl.act. *pirpso*, but this looks like the expected form of the Ipv III made to the Pt III *yerpsa.* The 2.pl. ending *-es* is mostly found in texts of eastern provenance (*petes*, *pokses*, and also *poñes*), the ending *-so* is confined to Šorčuq (*pontso*, *petso*), at least as far as Classes VI and V are concerned; in contrast, *plakäskes* attested in PK AS 17D a 5 is most likely not an eastern form.[10] The 2.sg.act. ending *-e*, on the other hand, is not restricted to a special variety of Tocharian B at all.

Hackstein, 2001, 17ff. has cogently derived *pete* from PIE *do, i.e., *doh$_3$ 'give!' with loss of laryngeal in absolute final position and hence *-o > *-e.*[11] Instead of the analogy Hackstein invoked in order to explain the *-t-* (instead of *-ts-*), Peters, 2004, 431, fn. 12 proposes a (pre-PT) gemination of the root initial, which is indeed often attested in Tocharian imperative forms after the particle,[12] thereby getting *po-ddo, which may have resulted in *pætæ.

As for the other imperatives showing an ending 2.sg.act. *-e*, 2.pl.act. *-es*, Hackstein toys with the idea of an analogical transfer

---

[8] Couvreur, 1954, 80 doubts the reading *[p](e)[tso]* in 25 b 2, but see ²TochSprR, 187 and Hackstein, 2001, 21, fn. 12. The original manuscript is lost, but one can generally trust Siegling's readings.

[9] Crosslinguistically, imperatives with the meaning 'give' rank indeed among the most frequent suppletive imperatives (see Veselinova, 2006, 139).

[10] Almost all texts from the Pelliot collection came from the Kuča region; see Pinault, 2007, 170f.

[11] As for Ipv PIE *doh$_3$ > *dŏ by a lautgesetzlich loss of final laryngeal in pausa position; see already Bammesberger, 1992, 44, fn. 11. For similar Greek imperative forms, see also Malzahn, 2000, 208, fn. 11.

[12] Cf. *pokkāka* 'call!', *päccauk* 'hide!', *päccapa* 'proclaim!', *pättāsat* 'put!', *pärrittar* 'persist!'. The same phenomenon is also found in the reduplicated preterit participle, in compounds, and in sentence sandhi, e.g., after TA/TB *mā* 'not'; see chap. Sound Laws 1.8.

from *pete, petes*, but, nevertheless, admits himself that there seems to be no motivation traceable for such a transfer.

Further, it has to be pointed out that apart from the ending *-e(-)* all these imperatives in question also show an irregular stem formation. While from a synchronic point of view the stem of the imperative generally matches somehow a preterit stem of the respective root either attested or predictable, these imperative stems do not relate to a preterit but to a subjunctive stem:

ptälle-ñ with *-ll-* < *-ln-* is clearly related to the present and subjunctive stem *tälnā-* (there is no certain preterit form attested, but a preterit stem with *-ll-* could only have been based on this *nā-* present/subjunctive itself);

pokse with non-palatalized stem final *-s-* clearly differs from the preterit stem with persistent *-ṣ-* (not †*pokṣa*, or at least †*pokṣe*), and hence matches the variant of the thematic subjunctive stem with *-s-*, i.e., *ākse-*. While the basic meaning of the root *āks-* is 'announce, proclaim', the imperative can be used as a synonym to semantically unmarked *poñ* 'say!'.

From the antigrundverb of *pläṅk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'sell' one would expect an *s-* imperative †*pleṅk* instead of *peplyaṅke*; the form is even irregular with respect to the fact that in Tocharian B roots beginning with *p-* do not show a surfacing trace of the imperative particle, but there is another form from a root with initial *p°*, Ipv III 2.pl.act. *pepīltso* 'listen' (Š), which has also *pe-*. The stem of *peplyaṅke* also matches a thematic subjunctive stem.

To be brief, the other *e*-imperatives cannot have been formed on the model of the one Ipv *pete(s)* which has an *-e(-)* that can be easily accounted for, and it is also highly implausible that they were simply somehow influenced by this *pete(s)*, since there is no other semantic or formal relationship between *pete(s)* and the rest of the *e*-imperatives.

37.7. THE IRREGULAR IMPERATIVES — CLASS VII

The imperatives of *i-/ᴬi-* 'go' and *klyaus-/ᴬklyos-* 'hear, listen' are irregular formations from a synchronic point of view, as is the synchronically opaque Ipv 2.sg.act. TA *paṣ* 'give!', 2.pl.act. *pac*, while the Ipv from *lä-n-t-/ᴬlä-n-t-* 'go out' matches perfectly the thematic preterit of Class VI, TB *lac*, TA *läc*, which is, however, an irregular formation itself.

The following forms are attested in Tocharian B:

2.SG.ACT.: *paṣ, päklyauṣ/ päklyauṣä/ pklyauṣ*; 2.PL.ACT.: *pcīso/ cisso, päklyauṣso/ pklyausso*,[13] *platstso*; 2.SG.MID.: —; 2.PL.MID.: —.

The following forms are attested in Tocharian A:

2.SG.ACT.: *piṣ, pläc, päklyoṣ, paṣ*; 2.PL.ACT.: *pic/ picäkk/ piś/ picäs, pälcäs, päklyoṣäs/ päklyossū, pac*; 2.SG.MID.: —; 2.PL.MID.: —; 2.DU.: *pines*.

37.7.1.   *The imperative of ᴬᴮi- 'go'*

Most scholars agree that the irregular Tocharian imperative of *i-/ ᴬi-* 'go' directly continues the PIE present imperative of *√h_1eĭ 'go'. There are some problems, however. On the one hand, there is some debate on how to explain the *-ṣ* in the 2.sg. *paṣ/* TA *piṣ*, while the *-c(-)* to be seen in the 2.pl. is generally agreed to be a lautgesetzlich reflex of PIE 2.pl. *-te*: 2.pl. *pcīso, cisso/* TA *pic* < PT *pä-yäcä < PIE *h_1i-té; the variant TA *picäs* shows secondary adding of the 2.pl.act. ending TA *-äs*, TB 2.pl. *pcīso, cisso* show respective behavior, cf. Pinault, 2005, 507. As for the 2.sg., Jasanoff, 1987, 106ff. assumed that word-final PIE *-ti/*-dʰí could turn into PT *-ṣä, hence 2.sg. *paṣ/* TA *piṣ* could be derived from PIE *h_1i-dʰí via PT *pä-yäṣä; quite similarly, on the 2.sg. *-ṣ* Klingenschmitt, 1987, 188 = 2005, 266, fn. 64. Pinault, 2005, 514, and 2006a, 270f. objects to sound law *-dʰí > *-ṣä and works with a "palatalisation progressive" *-eT# → -ṣ#; it is merely the phonological details assumed by the two scholars that differ quite a lot.

On the other hand, Tocharian B does not have †*pĭ̌-*, the expected outcome of PT *päyä-, but *pä-* instead. Possibly in pre-Tocharian B, *päyäṣä, *päyäcäså underwent irregular metathesis, thereby turning into *päṣäyä, *päcäyäså, which would also explain the *-ĭ̌-* met in *pciso, cisso*.

The 2.pl.act. *platstso*, 2.sg.act. TA *pläc*, and 2.pl.act. TA *pälcäs* from ᴬᴮ*lä-n-t-* 'go out' stand beside a thematic preterit, while the 2.pl.act. Ipv *platstso* corresponds to the 2.pl.act. Pt *latso*, whereas the TA preterit seems to have generalized the palatalized stem variant in the whole preterit stem.

---

[13] Sieg/Siegling (and hence WTG, 9) list a 2.pl.act. variant *päklyauṣäs* in the glossary to TochSprR(B), 118, but since this form cannot be found anywhere in the available texts, I hesitate to take it for granted. A *päklyauṣäs* would be the only 2.pl. active imperative with the ending *-äsä showing up as *-äs* instead of *-so* in Tocharian B.

37.7.2.   *The imperative of klyaus-/ᴬklyos- 'hear, listen'*

Jasanoff, 1987, 95ff. argues that it is difficult to regard 2.sg.act. *päklyauṣ* 'listen!' as an inner-Tocharian creation, because even if one assumed a "subsequent truncation of **(pä)klyauṣā* to **(pä)klyauṣ*" on the basis of the corresponding palatalized *ā*-preterit stem *klyauṣā-*, the former existence of an imperative active **(pä)klyauṣā* is highly unlikely because there are no 2.sg. active forms in *-ā* attested to imperatives based on secondary preterit stems. All such imperatives are, in fact, middle forms.[14] This view can further be supported by the fact that there is now a 2.pl. imperative active form actually attested made from a root with a secondary *ṣṣā*-preterit, namely *plakäskes*, and this indeed shows the *e-* and not the *ā*-inflection. What is more, *plakäskes* has the non-palatalized suffix allomorph. Consequently, even if one wants to work with loss of a former ending *-e* in *päklyauṣ* (which is as likely as the loss of an *-ā*, because both processes would be irregular in any case), the more serious objection to such a preform is that there are indeed no imperative active forms attested beside preterit stems in *-ṣṣ-* or beside *ā*-preterits with palatalized root final like *päklyauṣ*. And even if one wants to assume a 2.sg.act. *päklyauṣ* being a very recent creation based on the synchronic *ā*-preterit *klyauṣā-* with loss of a final ending, this is definitely impossible for the 2.pl.act. *päklyauṣso* showing **-äs-* instead of the productive 2.pl.act. ending *-ās(o)* of the *ā*-imperative. This **-äs-* could further not be explained as simply having the same ending **-äs-* as the one in the *ā*-preterit, because there **-äsV* has to be explained as a pre-TA innovation itself. Accordingly, the paradigm *päklyauṣ, päklyauṣso* is most certainly a relic requiring a special diachronic explanation. As for the possible preform of *päklyauṣ*, Jasanoff, 1987, 97ff. objects to the traditional derivation from a PIE thematic present imperative **ḱleu̯se*, and concludes that *päklyauṣ* can be a direct cognate of Ved. *śróṣi* by

---

[14] The middle imperatives from such roots devoid of A-character with palatalized *ā*-preterits such as *pāṣṣat* from *pāsk-*, or TA *pwleṣār* from *ᴬwles-* certainly have secondarily taken over the palatalization from the middle preterit, because *ās-* 'carry', which forms a thematic subjunctive but has a suppletive preterit stem, has a non-palatalized middle 2.pl. Ipv *pasāt*. There is also another explanation for the form available. Its singular stem should show *e*-inflection, i.e., we would expect †*pāse* instead of *pāsa* (as in *pokse*) or †*pāṣ* (as if from **pās'ä*). Being a root with final *-s*, the imperative may also have been taken as an *s*-imperative, and the 2.sg.act. could consequently be explained like 2.sg. "active" Ipv III *peṅksa*; see above.

likewise continuing a PIE *si*-imperative *ḱléu̯si (similarly Normier, 1980, 258, fn. 26 but without detailed discussion), because Jasanoff further shows that the *si*-imperative has indeed to be set up already for PIE (but differently on the Anatolian comparanda, Oettinger, 2007, 561ff.). While Rix, 1990, 43f. objects to the PIE age of a *si*-imperative *ḱléu̯si, and rather supports the old explanation from "präsentischen — besser: desiderativen — Ipf. *ḱleu̯-se", it has to be pointed out for Tocharian that the imperative of *päklyauṣ* is an inherited, synchronically opaque form.[15]

The TA ending variant 2.pl.act. *-su* attested once in TA *päklyossū* is generally derived from PIE *-su̯e (see, e.g., TEB I, § 463,4, 259), but see now the objections by Pinault, 2005, 515ff., who rather connects TA *päklyossū* with the 2.pl. TB variant *pklyausso* attested in a prose text from Sängim, i.e., written in the eastern variety of Tocharian B. Both forms show assimilation of *-ṣs- to *-ss-, and as for the final TA *-u* reminiscent of TB *-so*, Pinault aptly refers to TA *-u* vs. TB *-o* met again in TA *nu* 'now' vs. TB *no* 'id.'.

37.8. Diachronic Treatment

TEB I, 235, § 424 states: "Der toch. Imperativ geht in der Stammbildung meist mit dem Präteritum, seltener mit dem Konjunktiv zusammen". This is certainly true from a synchronic point of view: it is simply a fact that the stem formation of both categories usually is the same, and that further the imperative endings of the 2. plural active and of the 2. persons of the middle are also the same as those in the preterit. Diachronically, however, the imperative stem was rather correlated with what came to be the subjunctive stem, as already pointed out by Adams, 1978, 281, and 284, fn. 29 and recently by Pinault, 2008, 606f. This is still clear from the fact that all ablauting Class I and Class III imperatives show exactly the same ablaut and stem formation as the corresponding *subjunctive* stems in both languages,[16] i.e., æ/ä-ablaut, cf., e.g., the forms from *AB*kärs⁽ᵃ⁾- 'know',

---

[15] In any case, since PIE *-eu̯- does not lead to TB *-au-, the root vocalism has at least either to be analogical, or one has to set up an ē-grade *ḱlēu̯s° for the preform of the imperative as well. Such a preform *klēu̯se is, e.g., assumed by Adams, 1988a, 61.

[16] There is no ablauting athematic subjunctive stem of Class I attested in TA, but this is just due to the fact that this stem formation was generally replaced by the ñ-subjunctive of Class VII.

pärk- 'ask', and *käl-* 'bear'. Other roots show no ablaut at all in the preterit, but the same *æ/ä-*ablaut in both the subjunctive and the imperative, e.g., *pälk^(a)-* 'see', *pälsk^(a)-* 'consider', *lu^(a)-* 'send'. Cf. the following pattern:

Sub V 3.sg.act. *kārsaṃ*, 3.pl.act. **karsaṃ*, 3.sg.mid. *karsatär;*
Pt I 3.sg.act. *śarsa*, 3.pl.act. *śärsāre*, 3.sg.mid. *kärsāte*;
Ipv I 2.sg.act. *pkārsa*, 2.pl.act. *pkarsas/pkarsaso.*

TA Sub V 3.sg.act. *krasaṣ*, 3.pl.act. *kärseñc*, 3.sg.mid. *kärsātär;*
TA Pt I 3.sg.act. *śärs*, 3.pl.act. *krasar* (?), 3.sg.mid. *kärsāt*;
Ipv I 2.sg.act. *päkras*, 2.pl.act. *pkärsäs.*

Sub I 3.sg.act. *prekäṃ*, 3.pl.act. *parkäṃ*, 3.sg.mid. **parktär;*
Pt III 3.sg.act. *preksa*, 3.pl. *prekar*, 3.pl.mid. *parksante*;
Ipv III 2.sg.act. **prek*, 2.pl.mid. *parksat.*

Sub I 1.sg.act. *kelu*, 3.pl.act. **kaläṃ*, 3.sg.mid. **kaltär;*
Pt III 3.sg.act. *keltsa*, 1.sg.mid. *källamai*;
Ipv III 2.sg.act. *pkel*, 2.pl.act. **pkaltso.*

Sub V 3.sg.act. *pālkaṃ*, 1.pl.act. *palkam;*
Pt I 3.sg.act. *palyka*, 3.pl.act. *pälykāre*, 3.sg.mid. *pälkāte*;
Ipv I 3.sg.act. *pālka*, 2.pl.act. *palkas*, 2.pl.mid. *palkar.*

Since in my view all Tocharian subjunctive forms go back to former (pre-)PT (but certainly not PIE) present forms, I would then even like to state that seemingly almost all of the Tocharian imperatives started out as present imperatives. This becomes clear from:

(1) the *e-*imperatives (except *pete(s)*) in general;

(2) the 2.sg.act. imperatives of Class I that have PT **æ* as a root vowel, and thereby go together with the respective Class V subjunctives rather than with the respective Class I preterit forms;

(3) the TA 2.sg.act. imperative form TA *ptas* of Class III, which also has a non-palatalizing PT **æ* as a root vowel, and therefore is closer to what might have been a TA equivalent of the TB Class I subjunctives that have **æ/ä* apophony, than to the active paradigm of the TA Class III preterit of the respective root, which shows *cas-*, and therefore a palatalizing PT **æ* as root vowel;

(4) the form *psainar*, which lacks the *-s-* typical of all the middle forms of Class III preterits, and belongs to a former nasal infix present;

(5) 2.sg.act. *pśāy* and 2.pl.act. *pśaiso*, from the PIE > Very Early pre-PT present stem **g^w ịoh_3-ụ-e/o-*;

(6) the 2.sg.mid. imperative ending TB *-ar*, TA *-ār*, which is reminiscent of the present middle endings in TB *-tar*, TA *-tār* (as per Pinault, 1989, 162), and not of any preterit middle ending.

Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that synchronically, at least the members of the imperative classes II and III were rather associated with the respective preterit Classes II and III, witness forms such as TB *päccauk*, *śālāt* (from Class II), and all the middle imperative forms of Class III that have a morpheme (*)-*sā*-, which is otherwise only typical of Class III preterits, and must undoubtedly have been taken over from there.

The main reason for this association may have been that probably already in (pre-)PT times all regular present imperatives used the (pre-)PT regular preterital endings in the 2.pl. forms rather than the (pre-)PT regular present endings, that is to say, shared in the 2.pl. forms the endings with the preterits rather than with the presents. Such a (pre-)PT state of affairs is at least to be expected from a PIE point of view, because in PIE, quite obviously, the injunctive forms with the secondary = preterital endings were used as, or instead of, 2.pl. imperative forms.

A special comment is called for by the 2.pl. active ending(s) of the imperatives and preterits. To judge from the variant -*so* that is constantly met in all 2.pl.act. forms of TB Class III imperatives, and TA -*sū* in TA *päklyossū*, the pre-PT ending has been *-sas, i.e., most probably an ending PIE *-sh$_2$a reminiscent of both the 2.sg. middle/perfect ending *-th$_2$a and the 2.pl. active primary ending *-th$_2$a, to which an *-s had been added that most probably had been taken over analogically from the 1.pl. ending *-mes.

Now, whenever PT *-sās was attached to a stem ending in PT *-ā-, the result would have been a sequence *-āsās, which would have run the risk of undergoing haplology. Therefore, it is quite feasible to assume that PT *-āsās (or already pre-PT *-asas) underwent dissimilation into PT *-āsäs (pre-PT *-asäs). On the other hand, PT *-sās (pre-PT *-sas) was most likely preserved after any other vowel at least in the PT period.

As for Tocharian B, it seems that in the historical period there was finally a tendency to generalize the variant -*so* in the imperatives (witness the existence of Class I imperatives in -*so* even in prose texts), and to generalize *-sä in the preterit forms (witness the one Class III preterit form *maitas*). A similar tendency may have arisen already in that prehistorical ancestor variant of (pre-)Tocharian A which still had preserved word-final vowels; but then by a "materialistic" kind of morphological/analogical change, instead of the ending variant (*)-*su* (from pre-PT *-sas) rather the whole complex *-äsu may have been generalized, given the fact that (*)-*su* originally would have occurred

not after (*)-*a*-, but only after *-*ä*-.[17] That way we can explain the regular use of TA -*äs* not only in all the respective Class III, but also even in all respective Class I imperative forms.[18]

To sum up, in my opinion, the Class I *ā*-imperatives basically continue ablauting athematic formations from roots with A-character (= *ā*-subjunctives typically accompanied by an *ā*-preterit), the Class III *s*-imperatives continue ablauting athematic formations without A-character (= Class I subjunctives usually accompanied by an *s*-preterit), while the *e*-imperative is a relic class of formations without root ablaut, namely thematic stems and in one case a non-ablauting seemingly athematic *nā*-stem. The kausativum imperative of Class IV was likewise originally rather correlated with the *sk*-subjunctive stem than with the persistently palatalized *ṣṣā*-preterit stem, which is the reason why the 2.pl. active of Class IV ends in non-palatalized °*skes* (just like the *e*-imperative *pokses*). For the Class II imperatives, I follow basically Hilmarsson, 1991, 49ff. As for the *e*-imperatives based on thematic stems without palatalized stem final, one could at first glance toy with the idea that the ending -*e* added to the non-palatalized stem goes back to the *æ*-variant of the thematic vowel (< pre-PT *-o), as per Watkins, 1969, 208; however, this would not explain why we are also facing -*e* with athematic *tällā*- and *tällä*-, and we find otherwise only the *e*- and not the *o*-allomorph of the thematic vowel in 2. person imperative forms from PIE thematic stems. Accordingly, the *e*-imperatives seem to remain a puzzle, at least if one does not want to adopt the solution by Peters, 2006, 330, fn. 2, who proposed that -*e* goes back to a contamination of the two imperative endings *-ā + *ä resulting in -*e* by sound law.

---

[17] As for the preservation of (*)-*su* in TA *päklyossū*, evidently we have to start from a proto-form that bore irregularly two different word accents, compare German *h´ör´et* and *h´ört, h´ört*.

[18] As for the TA 2.sg.act. forms of Class I imperatives, it is very likely that they ended in PT *-ā, which is even met in the TA 2.sg.act. forms of the Class III imperatives; the absence of PT *-ā- in the TA 2.sg.act. Class I imperative from the root/stem *tāk(ā)*- is due to the fact that in TA, forms of the verbum substantivum tend to undergo irregular phonological reduction in general.

INDEX OF TOCHARIAN VERBAL FORMS

This index contains only verbal roots. Its main purpose is the presentation of the stem pattern of a root. The presentation of a lemma has two parts: first all actually attested forms, followed by a discussion part.

As a rule, I use the simplified transcription in both the presentation of the averbo and usually also in the discussion part, but with the following exceptions: I always give a transliteration (even for single word forms) in the discussion part whenever the form or the passage has not been edited yet. As for the ending variants of the 3.sg./pl.mid., 1.pl.mid., and 1.pl.mid., I use *-(°)är* as the default form in the presentation of the averbo, regardless of the actual writing. Generally, I do not mark damaged or restored akṣaras in the presentation of the stem pattern, but problematic cases are addressed in the discussion part that follows. I usually refer to the provenance of the text of an attestation only when the form is problematic or otherwise interesting, e.g., with respect to the accent (e.g., with respect to MQ forms).

The order of verbal forms within subparadigms is 1.sg., 2.sg., 3.sg.; 1.pl., 2.pl., 3.pl. (possibly followed by dual forms), active| middle; if a person is not attested, this is indicated by a small hyphen -; if the whole singular or plural paradigm is unattested, I use a long dash — (following in this respect the model of Adams, DoT). A vertical stroke | divides active and middle paradigms, and nominative and oblique PPt forms; a slash / divides variants attested for one and the same form. The subparadigms are listed as follows: present/imperfect; subjunctive/optative; preterit; past participle; imperative.

A double class marking like "I/II" means the class is ambiguous; assignments such as "I + III" indicate mixed paradigms of both stem classes.

Apart from the finite verbal forms, I list the gerundives I and II, the respective abstracts and the privative; as for other nominal derivatives, I only discuss them if they are diagnostic for the root or verbal stem in question.

Textual attestations are only included if they are not yet cited in the verbal index of WTG, TG, or Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 269ff. Text passages quoted in these reference works are only discussed if my interpretation differs from the one given in these handbooks. Since the main purpose of this index is the morphological representation of the verbal roots, I only cite additional attestations of already known

verbal forms found in yet unpublished texts when they are relevant for phonological or morphological reasons.

The alphabetical order of the lemmata follows the TB roots. Corresponding TA roots are given directly under the respective TB root, in order to give an easy overview of the whole averbo. For the abbreviations see the introductory chapter. The alphabetical order is:

*a – ā – ä – ĭ – ŭ – e – ai – o – au – k – ṅ – c – ñ – t – n/ṃ – p – m – y – r –
l – ly – v – w – ś – ṣ – s – ts.*

There is no special lemma for the 3.sg. *meṣṣäṃ* 'he wrestles' that according to Schmidt, 2001b, 80 is attested in a graffito in the so-called 'Treppenhöhle' in Qizil, and for isolated *mīretär-ne* (IOL Toch 201 b 6 as read by Peyrot, 2007, s.v.) *mlaṅkäṃ* (351 frg. 2) and *śärkāte •* in THT 1181 b 2 (apparently an MQ text), which are most likely verbal forms, because they are found in sentence-final position. For TA *[āt](aträ)* from ᴬ*āt-* 'be patient' (= Skt. *kṣam-*), see Carling, DThTA, s.v. *āt-*.

A

añmañ- 'wish' → *āñm-ªññ-* 'id.'

Aar- 'evoke' → *er-* 'id.'

Aar- 'cease' → *ār⁽ª⁾-* 'id.'

Aart- 'be pleased with' → *ārt(t)⁽ª⁾-* 'id.'

Aarṣaṣ-ⁱññ- 'passen (von Kleidung)', 'fit (of clothes)' (itr) (m/-/-)

          Prs XII (m) -,-, *arṣaṣintär*; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
          Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
          Pt —
          PPt —
          Ipv —

Hapax in YQ 25 a 4; the meaning is assured by an Old Turkish parallel version. ETYM. According to Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 170, fn. 3, this is a deadjectival stem, the "underlying noun *aräṣ*"" possibly being a cognate of TB *ersna* 'shape'.

anāsk- 'breathe' → *ān⁽ª⁾-sk-* 'id.'

alāsk- 'be sick' → *ālª-sk-* 'id.'

Aas- 'dry' → *ās⁽ª⁾-* 'id.'

Ā

āk- 'führen', 'lead, guide, drive' (tr) (x/-/-)

          Prs II (x) -,-, *āśäṃ*;-,-, *ākeṃ* | -,-, *āśtär*; — Imp —
                nt-Part *aśeñca*
                m-Part *akemane*
                Ger I *aśalle* Abstr I —
          Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
          Pt —

      PPt —
      Ipv —

The root provides the suppletive present stem to *wāy^ā-* 'lead'. The 1.pl. form *akem* listed in TEB I, 198, § 355,1 is probably only reconstructed. The 3.sg.mid. Prs (in passive function) *āśtär* is attested in PK NS 230 b 1 (Pinault, 1994, 108f.). Pace WTG, 219, *akoyt* in SI P/2 = Pe 1 b 5 is no Imp of this root; see Couvreur, 1954, 84 and Pinault, 2008, 295.

= *^Aāk-* 'führen', 'lead, guide, drive' (tr) (x/-/-)
      Prs II (x) —;-,-, *ākeñc*| -,-, *āśtär*;— Imp —
          nt-Part *āśant*
          m-Part *ākmāṃ*
          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —

The root provides the suppletive present stem to *^Awā-* 'lead'. The 1.pl. TA *ākamäs* listed in TEB I, 198, § 355,1 is most likely only reconstructed.

SEM. There is no noticeable semantic difference between the active and middle forms, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 384f. ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√h₂eĝ (or maybe *√h₁aĝ) 'treiben' (²LIV, 255f.); Adams, DoT, 36f.

ākl- 'lernen', 'learn' (tr) (-/m/m)
      Prs IXa — Imp —
          nt-Part *aklaṣṣeñca*
          m-Part —
          Ger I *akalṣälle/akalṣle* 'pupil' Abstr I —
      Sub IV (m) -,-, *aklyitär*;— Opt —;-,-, *aklyiyentär*
          Ger II — Abstr II *aklyilñe* Priv —
          Inf *aklyitsi*
      Pt VII (m) *aklyīyamai/aklyamai, aklyyatai, aklyyate*;—
      PPt *āklu*| in *āklorsa* (MQ)
      Ipv —

The *nt*-Part *aklaṣṣeñca* in 197 a 6 belongs to the grundverb, as per Winter, 1961, 94 = 1984, 166 = 2005, 33. The preterit class is certainly Pt VII (pace the manuals), which is indeed the expected one beside a Sub IV. The 1.sg. Pt variant *aklyīyamai* is attested in Or. 15010/5 a 2 (see Tamai, 2009, 664; pace Tamai, the form is, of course, Pt not Opt). The 3.sg.mid. *aklyitär* is Sub in 328 b 5 and H add.149 86 a 2; I cannot find a respective Opt *aklyitär* (as listed in TochSprR(B), glossary, 88).

KAUSATIVUM IV 'lehren', 'teach' (tr) (x/-/-)
      Prs IXb (x) -,-, *ākläṣṣäṃ*;— | -,-, *āklästär-ne*;— Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —

            Ger I *ākläṣṣälle* Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —
Ger I *ākläṣṣälle* is attested in PK AS 7F (= K 6) a 5.
= ^A*ākl-* act. 'lehren', 'teach', mid. 'lernen', 'learn' (tr) (x/-/-)
    Prs VIII (x) -,-, *ākläṣ*;-,-, *ākälseñc* | —;-,-, *ākälsantär* Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I *ākälṣäl* Abstr I —
        Inf *āklässi*
    Sub IV — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *āklyuneyā*
    Pt III in
    PPt *āklu*
    Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. Whereas in TB 'learn' and 'teach' are denoted by grundverb and kausativum respectively, TA only has the morphological equivalent of the TB kausativum, the active forms of which have the basic meaning 'teach' like in TB, and the middle of which has the meaning of the TB grundverb, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 356ff. The infinitive in YQ 29 a 7 means 'to teach', whereas the infinitive in A 338 a 3 more likely means 'to learn', and the Abstract II has the meaning 'teaching, doctrine'. Eᴛʏᴍ. According to Winter, 1990, 376f. = 2005, 398f., the verb is based on a noun "*akəl*" derived from "PIE *aĝ- 'say'"; *aklyi-* is said by Winter to derive from a denominative formation "with a suffix reflecting PIE *-ye-/-yo-", but if that was the case, one would have expected either *akaly- or *ākly- throughout the whole TB paradigm. Schmidt, 1992, 112; 1997c, 545 and also Hilmarsson, 1996, 8ff. connected the verb with PIE *√k̑leu̯ ("*ō-k̑lu- 'listen to'"); this etymology would enable us to derive PT *āklä- met in the Prs IX and in the PPt from pre-PT *ō-klu-, and pre-TB *ākl'äy(ä)- met in the TB Sub IV and Pt VII from ablauting pre-PT *ō-kleu̯-e(/o)-; only the verbal abstracts *akalye* and TA *āklye* would have to be rather recently (i.e., in PT times) created analogical formations that were based on PT *āklä- and not inherited from pre-PT times.

āks- 'verkünden, lehren, sagen', 'announce, proclaim, say' (tr) (a+/x/a)
    Prs XI (a+) *aksaskau, aksasto, aksaṣṣäṃ*;-, *aksaścer, aksaskeṃ*
        Imp -,-, *aksaṣṣi*;-,-, *aksaṣyeṃ*
        nt-Part *aksaṣṣeñca*
        m-Part *aksaskemane*
        Ger I *aksaṣṣälle/āksaṣälle* (sic)/*aksaṣle* Abstr I —
    Sub II (x) *āksau,-, ākṣäṃ*;— | -,-, *ākṣtär*;—
        Opt *akṣim, akṣīt* (MQ), *ākṣi*;—

Ger II — Abstr II *akṣalñe/ākṣalñe* (M) Priv —

Inf *ākṣtsi/āksi*

Pt I (a) *akṣāwa, akṣāsta, ākṣa;-,-, akṣāre*

PPt *ākṣu| ākṣoṣ*

Ipv VI (a) *pokse, pokses* (S)

The 3.pl. Prs *aksaskeṃ* is attested in PK AS 18B a 4, PK AS 17G a 6 (see Pinault, 1984, 383 and 2008, 77), and PK AS 16.8 b 2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). A 3.pl. Imp *aksa(ṣyeṃ)* is metri causa to be restored in 28 b 7, according to Thomas, ²TochSprR(B), 193, contra TochSprR(B), glossary, 88, where *aksa(ṣṣiyeṃ)* is proposed; the same form *aksaṣyeṃ* is attested in PK AS 13E b 7 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

= ᴬ*āks-* 'verkünden, lehren', 'announce, proclaim' (tr) (a+/a/a)

Prs XI (a+) *āksisam,-, āksiṣ;* — Imp —

nt-Part *āksiṣant*

m-Part *āksismāṃ/ āksisamāṃ*

Ger I *āksiṣlaṃ* Abstr I —

Inf *āksissi*

Sub XII (a) *ākṣiññam,-,-; ākṣiññamäs,-,-* Opt *ākṣiññim, ākṣiññit/*

ākṣit-ñi (sic), *ākṣiñiṣ;* —

Ger II *ākṣiññäl* Abstr II *ākṣiñlune*

Pt V (a) -, *ākṣiñāṣt, ākṣiññā/ākṣñā-ṃ; ākṣiññāmäs, -, ākṣiññār*

PPt *ākṣiññu*

Ipv V (a) *pākṣiñ/pākṣiññā-ñi/pākṣñā-ṃ;-*

The 2.sg. Opt TA *ākṣit-ñi* in A 401 a 2 is rather to be derived from TA *ākṣiññit-ñi* via haplology (see TG, 423) than to be analyzed as a form built from a different subjunctive stem (thus Couvreur, 1947, 151 with morphological speculations). A syncopated 1.sg. Sub like the one in 197 b 2 is also attested in PK NS 1 b 1f.: TA *ṣotre ākṣñam-ci* "I will interpret the sign for you" (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The Abstr TA *ākṣi(ñlu)[n](e)* is also attested in a gloss on SHT 8, 1821, and the Ipv variant TA *pākṣñā-m* in YQ 13 a 4.

SEM. The less narrow meaning 'tell' instead of 'proclaim' is, e.g., attested in the Ipv *pokse-ñ* 'tell me!' in PK NS 36+20 a 1; the parallel passage 93 a 3 has *poñ* (→ *we-ñ-* 'say') (the passages are quoted by Thomas, 1993, 184). ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√h₂eǵ 'sagen' (²LIV, 256); see Hackstein, 1995, 332ff. in detail, who suggests that the *-s-* originated either in a desiderative or a sigmatic aorist. For the evidence of Lat. *axāre*, see most recently Nussbaum apud de Vaan, 2008, 32. For the TA *iññ-*stem, see Winter, 1977, 133ff. = 1984, 178ff. = 2005, 170ff.; Hilmarsson, 1991a, 94f.

āks³-'erwachen, erwecken', 'waken' (itr) (-/a/a)

Prs IX in *āksaṣe°* Imp —

nt-Part —

m-Part —

Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub V (a) -,-, *āksaṃ*; — Opt *āksoym*,-,-; —
Ger II — Abstr II *āksalñe* Priv —
Inf —
Pt I (a) -,-, *āksa*; —
PPt *āksau*
Ipv —

The manuals list an *nt*-participle *āksaṣṣeñca* (sic, e.g., TEB I, 215, § 387), which is based on a restoration by Sieg/Siegling, 1932, 486 in H 149.329 a 1: *pärkarya no āksaṣe(ñcatse yaṣi)* (sic, instead of a correct genitive *-eñcantse* and the correct nom. *yṣiye*); the passage is a rendering of Uv. 1.19a *dīrghā hi jāgarato rātriḥ* "long is the night for someone who is awake" (see Bernhard, 1965, 102). However, instead of an *nt*-participle, the restoration of an *nta*-nomen agentis *āksaṣe(nta)* is not only possible in theory, since the small remains of the following akṣara can, in my opinion, only belong to ⟨nta⟩, so that one should restore to *āksaṣe(ntantse yṣiye)* (it was yet unknown in 1932 that *yṣiye* is the correct nom.sg. of 'night'; see also chap. Prs Part 36.2.1.1.1.). Pace the manuals (TEB I, 215; § 387) and Hackstein, 1995, 327, 330, I see no reason to set up a Prs XI, but rather analyze the present stem as an *sk*-present to the root *āksᵃ*- (a present Class XI is, in my opinion, only synchronically justified if there is a TA equivalent in TA *-sis*-; see the discussion in chap. Prs XI). The subjunctive seems to be of the subclass with persistent initial accent. Sᴇᴍ. The verb is basically intransitive, but the 1.sg. Opt *āksoym* takes an inner accusative = oblique, thereby forming a figura etymologica: S 4 (= PK AS 4A) b 4f. *krent āksalñe ṣek ā[ks]oym* "ein gutes Erwachen möchte ich stets erwachen", see Couvreur, 1947, 150, fn. 3 and Pinault, 1990a, 65; for that kind of construction, see chap. Valency 4.10.3. Eᴛʏᴍ. Hilmarsson, 1996, 12f. derives the verb from PIE *√h₂eĝ 'lead' (like Prs *āk*- 'lead'), but this is not attractive. I'd rather like to suggest that the original meaning had been 'get sharp' (see already TEB I, 215, § 387: "Wohl urverwandt mit lat. *ācer, acus*, usw."), and that the basic stem *āksā- may have started out as an instr.sg. in PIE *-oh₁ or *-eh₂(e)h₁ of an abstract 'sharpness' derived from an adj. *h₂ek̂so- 'sharp', itself a possessive derivative in *-o- derived from the neuter *s*-stem *h₂ek̂-es- that is attested in *āke*, TA *āk* 'end, point, tip'.

āñm-ᵃñ̃- 'wünschen', 'wish, desire' (tr) (m/-/-)
Prs XII (m) *añmaññemar*, *āñmantar* (sic, Š),-;-,-, *añmañentär*
Imp -, *añmaññītar*, *añmaññitär*; —
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
Inf —
Pt —
PPt —

Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *āñmantär* in TEB I, 217, § 390 is most likely only reconstructed on the basis of the attested 2.sg. form with clearly erroneous *ā-*. The Imp or Opt *[a]ñmaññitär* is attested in PK NS 12 b 4 (Couvreur, 1967, 154); the 2.sg. *añmaññīta(r)* in the small fragment 374 frg. c can also be either Imp or Opt. ETYM. A denominative based on *āñme* 'wish'; see, e.g., Hilmarsson, 1991a, 82f.

ān⁽ᵃ⁾-sk- 'einatmen', 'breathe in, inhale' (itr) (x/-/-)

    Prs IXa (x) -,-, *anāṣṣäṃ*, — | -, *anāstar*,-; — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I *anāṣṣälle* Abstr I —
    Sub IXa — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *anāṣṣälñe* Priv —
        Inf *anāstsi*
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

2.sg.mid. Prs *anāstar* is attested in H add.149 88 a 1 (Broomhead I, 249f.). An Inf *anāst(s)i* is mentioned by Thomas, 1972, 443, fn. 5 without ref. (this form should also be restored in the Garbhāvakrāntisūtra text THT 1324 frg. b b 3; M. Peyrot, p.c.).

KAUSATIVUM I 'einatmen lassen', 'make breathe in' (tr) (x/-/-)

    Prs IXb (x) —; *ānäskem*,-,- | -,-, *ānästär-ne*; *ānäskemtär*,-,- Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

3.sg.mid. Prs *ānästär-ne* is attested in PK AS 17F b 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The 1.pl.act. *ānäskem* and 1.pl.mid. *ānäskemtär* are both found in an MQ text (574), which, however, does not seem to have MQ character, so their writing attests to Prs IXb as well; the passages are not very clear, so that, strictly speaking, causative semantics cannot be proven. ETYM. PIE *√h₂enh₁ 'breathe'; see, e.g., Melchert, 1978, 126f.; Schmidt, 1982, 367; Hackstein, 1995, 247f.; Pinault, 2009, 479f. Adams, 1988a, 67 sets up a "deverbative verb in *-eA-*" "PIE *AenE-eA-[sk̂e/o-]*". Cf. now also the *sk*-less noun TA *an** 'breath, sigh' (Carling, DThTA, s.v.).

āmp⁸- 'verfaulen', 'rot, decay' (?) (—)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —

        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt I in
    PPt *āmpauwa* (Š)
    Ipv —

ETYM. According to Hackstein, 1998, 219, a denominative from the lautgesetzlich PT result in *-p(w)ā- of a PIE *h₁n̥-puh₂/₃- 'Eiter in sich habend'; but probably rather based on a borrowing from Khotanese; see Adams, DoT, 45 and esp. 20 on *ampoño* 'rottenness' with an -ñ- hardly to be explained in Tocharian terms.

ār⁽ᵃ⁾- 'aufhören', 'cease, come to an end' (itr) (m/a/a)
    Prs IV (m) -,-, *orotär;* — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I *orolle* Abstr I —
    Sub V (a) -,-, *āraṃ;-,-, aran-me* (sic) Opt -,-, *āroy;-,-, aron* (MQ)
        Ger II — Abstr II *āralñe* Priv —
        Inf *āratsi*
    Pt I (a) -,-, *āra;-,-, arāre*
    PPt —
    Ipv —

The Ger I is attested in THT 1347 b 4 (MQ) (*parmaṅk̑ orolle* "hope has to cease"), the Abstr *āralñe* also in PK NS 414 a 3 (see Couvreur, 1966, fig. VI), and the 3.pl. Pt *[ar]ā[re]* (+ perlative) also in SHT 7, 1621 (reading: K. T. Schmidt). The subjunctive stem has persistent initial accent. Note the claim made by Thomas, 1957, 209ff. that precisely the Pt I *āra* 'ist zu Ende' preserved the semantics typical of a PIE perfect (similarly also Schmidt, 1997c, 565), but as a matter of fact, any kind of intransitive Toch. Pt could have grown such a special kind of semantics, cf. what Thomas, 1957, 213 himself wrote about *śem* (according to him 'ist da' in 246 a 1ff.).

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'verlassen, aufgeben', 'leave, give up, abandon' (tr) (a+/x/a)
    Prs VIII (a+) *ārsau, ārṣt, ārṣäṃ;-,-, ārseṃ* Imp -, *arṣit* (MQ),-; —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *arsemane*
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub I (x) -,-, *oräñ-c;* — | — ;-,-, *wräntär* (sic) Opt -,-, *āri;* —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf *ārtsi*
    Pt III (a) *orwa, orasta, orsa-c;-,-, arar-c*
    PPt —
    Ipv —

The 2.sg. Imp *arṣit* is attested in an MQ text (cf. Adakytlos et al., 2007, 41). WTG, 226 sets up a separate root for the forms with initial *or-*, but Cowgill, 1967, 174f. = 2006, 446f., and Schmidt, most recently 2000, 234, have shown that these forms are, in fact, ablaut variants from the same root. According to Sieg, 1938, 24, one can restore *[w]rän(tär)* in K 5 b 5: *mā [pa]ls[ko tä]rkoṣ [w]rän(tär)* "werden sie nicht den gefaßten Gedanken aufgeben". The existence of the morphologically enigmatic *ora* in 42 a 7 has been questioned by Schmidt, 1994b, 273f., most recently 2000, 235; on the other hand, Schmidt takes *orsa-c* in 243 a 2 (pace WTG, 289) as a regular *s*-preterit of this root, and *orwa* as regular 1.sg. Pt III (1985, 433); pace WTG, 226, Pt III is in any case certain because of the 2.sg. MQ variant *orästa*. For *arar-c*, see Winter, 1955a, 108; for the preterit forms in general, see Schmidt, 1994b, 273f.

KAUSATIVUM II 'aufgeben', 'give up, abandon' (tr) (a/m/a)

   Prs IXa/b (a) -,-, *arskaṣṣäṃ* (sic); — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I *ārṣṣälle* (Š) Abstr I —
   Sub IXa (m) — Opt -,-, *arṣṣītär-ñ* (sic); —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt IV (a) —;-,-, *arṣāre* (MQ)
   PPt *ārskoṣ*
   Ipv —

arskaṣṣäṃ (sic) is found on the right, unpublished fragment of K 1 (= PK AS 7A) a 5 (reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.) and in THT 1131 frg. b b 3 (see Tamai, 2007a, s.v.); the initial akṣaras of the two other attestations are damaged (THT 1415 frg. h b 2 as restored by M. Peyrot, p.c., and IOL Toch 963 a 2; see Tamai, 2007, s.v.); a 1.sg. Opt *arṣṣīmar* is possibly attested in THT 2251 a 3: //// *[s](o)motkaṃñe mā ceml=ārṣṣīmar* "likewise I will not abandon ...", but a word separation *ceṃ lārṣṣīmar* is also conceivable and perhaps more likely (although a root *lārsk-* is otherwise unattested, but so is a noun *ceṃlV*). 3.sg.mid. Opt *arṣṣītär-ñ* (in passive function) is attested in PK AS 17I b 3 (reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; cf. also Thomas, 1979, 178). Since the PPt to a Pt IV is expected to show stem-final palatalization, the manuals usually set up a separate verbal root *ārsk-* on account of *ārskoṣ*; differently, Winter, 1977, 140 = 1984, 185 = 2005, 177. As a matter of fact, Prs IXa *arskaṣṣäṃ* is clearly based on a separate stem pre-TB *ārsk(ā/o)- (NB: not *āräsk(ā/o)-), and no doubt one would very much like to reconstruct a Pt I PT *ārskā/å- being of the same kind as that met in TB *wärskānte* from *wär⁽ᵃ⁾-/ wärsk-* 'smell'. The problem is that by a development according to the sound laws, PT *ārskåwæs'ä should have turned into standard-TB †*arskoṣ*, whereas only PT *ārskäwæs'ä could have resulted in standard-TB *ārskoṣ*. Note, however, that a pre-TB *ārskóṣä would have been the only pre-TB PPt form with a word-initial full vowel to end in *-óṣä; actually, all other such PPt forms in (*)-*oṣä* carried the accent on the first syllable in standard Tocharian B,

and accordingly one could guess that a pre-TB *ārskóṣä had undergone an analogical accent shift to the left, thereby resulting precisely in standard-TB *ārskoṣ.*

= ᴬ**ār⁽ᵃ⁾-** 'aufhören', 'cease, come to an end' (itr) (m/a/a)

        Prs IV (m) -,-, *aratär;-,-, arantär* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *armāṃ*
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub V (a) -,-, *āraṣ;-,-, āreñc* Opt —
                Ger II *arl-ā* Abstr II *ārlune*
        Pt I (a) -,-, *ār;-,-, ārar*
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs TA *arant␣-m* is attested in THT 1308 frg. a a 2. Whether contextless A 205 a 3 *[lm]ārint␣* • contains a 3.pl.mid. Opt TA *ārint␣* is uncertain, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 38, fn. 1.

Aɴᴛɪɢʀᴜɴᴅᴠᴇʀʙ + Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ II 'aufgeben', 'give up, abandon' (tr) (a/-/-)

        Prs VIII (a) -,-, *āräṣ;* — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt IV in
        PPt *ārṣu*
        Ipv —

TG, "Nachträge", 486f. analyzed the unclear 3.sg.mid. Sub TA *aräñtar* (sic) in A 366 a 1, which is construed with the preverb TA *lo* 'away', as a form of this root, because it is indeed often found together with TA *lo* otherwise; such a subjunctive stem of Class VII would belong to the antigrundverb. TA *aräñtar* is either simply an error for TA †*āräñtar* (which is not too unlikely an assumption), or rather has as root vowel the same PT *å̄ that is met in the Sub I and Pt III of the TB antigrundverb. The Pt IV clearly belongs to the Kaus. II (= TB), while one cannot decide whether the present is a former Prs VIII (antigrundverb) or a former Prs IX (Kaus. II).

Sᴇᴍ. We may be dealing with an original triple root: intransitive 'cease' – transitive 'leave' – causative 'make leave' (as set up by WTG, 221), but the restored *[w]rän(tär)* K 5 b 5 (if restored correctly) has the same meaning 'abandon' as the kausativum. Eᴛʏᴍ. According to Hackstein, 1998, 228ff., to be derived from the zero-grade variant *$h_3r̥$- of PIE *√h_3er 'arise' (the full grade according to him being continued in *er-*/ ᴬ*ar-* 'evoke'; see below). Differently, Kümmel (in ²LIV, 271f.) derives the Toch. root from PIE *√h_2erH 'sich auflösen, verschwinden', followed by Peters, forthc., who further claims that the Pt III stem allomorph *or-* goes back to pre-PT *$ār$- < PIE *h_2e-$h_2or(H)$- and

the plural stem allomorph *ar-* goes back to pre-PT **ar-* < PIE **h₂e-h₂r̥H-* (> PT
*ār-; for **-ah₂r̥-* > pre-PT **-ar-* he compares PIE **-u̯ah₂m̥* > pre-PT **-u̯am* as
reflected in *kantwa*; hence, Hilmarsson, 1996, 13 would be wrong in claiming
that **h₂e-h₂oC-* resulted in pre-PT **aC-* > PT **āC-* instead).

ārc(-ᵃññ)- 'sollen', 'should, ought to' (itr) (m/-/-)
       Prs XII (m) -,-, *arcantär*; — Imp -, *arcaññītar, arccäññītär* (sic, MQ); —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
             Inf —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv V (m) *porcaññar*;-
According to Peyrot, 2007, s.v., one has to read *a(r)caññītar* in IOL Toch 212 (=
H add.148 87) b 4 (pace Broomhead I, 248) and =*ārcaññit(a)[r]* in IOL Toch 793
b 2. The 3.sg. Prs *arccaṃtär* is also attested in PK AS 17J a 6 (unpublished,
reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). *[ǎ]rccäññītr̥a* (Imp or Opt) is found in
THT 1321 a 6 (apparently an MQ text). The manuals list a suppletive
subjunctive stem *ārk-* for this root (TEB II, 167), but according to Winter,
1984a, 119 = 2005, 264 and Hilmarsson, 1991a, 89f., the alleged attestations of
that subjunctive stem are rather nominal forms. Whether *(a)rcos* (sic) in LP 23
a 3, respectively *ar[c]o* //// in LP 69 a 2 (cf. Pinault, 1987, 93, 105) are PPts of
this same root (as proposed by Adams, DoT, 50 with question mark) is
uncertain. Ipv *porcaññar-ñ* is also attested in the small fragment THT 1271 b
3. ETYM. Most likely a denominative verb, but the basic noun is unattested; see
Hilmarsson, 1991a, 89f. with ref.

ārt(t)⁽ᵃ⁾- 'für gut befinden, lieben, preisen', 'approve of, love, praise'
       (tr) (m/x/m)
       Prs IV (m) -,-, *orttotär*;-,-, *orttontär* Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub V (x) -,-, *artatär* (sic);-,-, *ārtantär* Opt -,-, *ārttoy*; — |
             ārttoymar,-, *ārtoytär*; —
             Ger II *ārttalyi* Abstr II *ārttalñe* Priv —
             Inf —
       Pt I (m) *artamai* (MQ), *arttātai, arttāte*;-,-, *arttānte*
       PPt *ārttau* | *arttaṣ* (sic, Š)
       Ipv —
3.sg.mid. Sub *arta(t)[r̥a]* is attested in THT 1539 frg. e + c a 2 (see Schmidt,
2006, 463; also listed in TEB I, 227, § 412,1), 3.sg. Opt *ārttoy* in KVāc 22 b 5 (see

Schmidt, 1986, 56), 1.sg.mid. Pt *artamai* in 595 b 7 (MQ), Ger II *ārttalyi* in KVāc 28 b 1 (see Schmidt, 1986, 60). The Abstr II *ārtalñe* is also found in PK AS 7O a 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), and apart from the two attestations given in WTG, 221, the 1.pl.mid. Opt *ārt(t)oymar* is often attested in texts from the Paris collection (G.-J. Pinault, p.c.) as well. The subjunctive stem has persistent initial accent.

KAUSATIVUM III 'anerkennen, freudig zustimmen, erfreuen an', 'acknowledge; rejoice in' (tr) (m/-/-)

Prs IXa (m) *artaskemar,-, artastär;-, arttastär, arttaskentär* Imp —
   nt-Part —
   m-Part *artaskemane*
   Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub — Opt —
   Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
   Inf —
  Pt —
  PPt —
  Ipv —

1.sg.mid. Prs *artaskemar* is also attested in Or. 8212/1673(i) a 2; 3.sg.mid. Prs *artastär* is found in PK AS 7M a 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), a 3.pl.mid. Prs *[a](rt)t(as)k(e)nträ* is to be restored in KVāc 22 b 1 (see Schmidt, 1986, 55).

= ᴬ*ārt*ᴮ*-* 'lieben, preisen', 'love, praise' (tr) (m/m/m)

Prs IV (m) *artmār, artār, artär* (sic); — Imp —
   nt-Part —
   m-Part —
   Ger I *artal* Abstr I —
   Inf —
  Sub V (m) —;-,-, *ārtantär* Opt *ārtimār,-, ārtitär;*—
   Ger II — Abstr II *ārtlune*
  Pt I (m) -,-, *ārtat;-,-, ārtant*
  PPt *ārtu*
  Ipv I (m) *pārtār;-*

TA *artär* in A 60 b 5 is analyzed as 3.sg. Prs passive of this root by Schmidt, 1974, 260: *ñäkci napeṃṣi kär-paräṃ ñi mā artär* "... göttliche [und] menschliche Würde wird von mir nicht gelobt", which would imply that the form is "verschrieben" for †*artatär*. The Ger I is attested in THT 2472 a 2: //// *artal knān(al)* //// (Carling, DThTA, s.v. *artal*).

SEM. 3.sg. Opt *ārttoy* attested in KVāc 22 b 5 is the equivalent of Skt. *kṣamate*, which points to a more general basic meaning 'für gut befinden, für richtig halten', as per Schmidt, 1986, 140: *preke ārttoy* "(wenn) der Zeitpunkt recht sein sollte". It is quite remarkable that the Prs IV made from this root is transitive. As for the Kausativum III, whereas WTG, 221 and TEB II, 167 explicitly state that there is no noticeable difference in meaning between the grundverb and the kausativum, Sieg/Siegling (TochSprR(B), glossary, 91, followed by Schmidt, 1974, 394) translate it with 'anerkennen', which is correct

for 44 a 1 and 108 a 7. On the other hand, *(a)rtaskemane* in 23 b 8 is the equivalent of Skt. *anumodamānaḥ* 'rejoicing in' (note that in the bilingual text 543 b 6 and likewise in the TA passage A 464 b 4 Skt. *anu* √mud 'froh und dankbar annehmen, freudig zustimmen', as per SWTF, s.v., is translated by the root *ᴬᴮwärpᵃ-* 'enjoy, etc.'). Similarly, *arttaskentär* in KVāc 22 b 1 also has the meaning 'sie werden freudig zustimmen', as per Schmidt, 1986, 90. One has to conclude that, if there is any at all, the semantic difference between the grundverb and the kausativum is very slight. Quite remarkably, we find (stressed!) *-ä-* instead of expected (*)-ā- in the TB kausativum present. Eᴛʏᴍ. One should not try to explain TB *-tt-* by setting up a proto-form with *-tw-, because such a cluster had to be preserved in TA; see Hackstein, 1998, 226. According to both Hackstein, l.c., and Hilmarsson, 1996, 44ff., we are dealing here with a denominative verb, but whereas Hackstein claims the underlying noun was an "uridg. *to*-Partizip *h_2r-tó-", Hilmarsson assumes the verb was based on a verbal abstract PIE *$h_2$ér-to- 'fixation, attention, care' (> *ārtte*, TA *ārtak* 'care, attention'; but see now Carling, DThTA, s.v.), or a substantivized verbal adj. PIE *$h_2$ér-to- 'one who is fixed on something' (> TA *ārt* "suitor, pretendant"). The root is usually set up as PIE *√$h_2$er 'sich (zusammen)fügen' (²LIV, 269f.), but this seems to be at variance with the probable Anatolian evidence for this root (as recently discussed by Cohen, 2002, 23f.), which clearly lacks a root-initial laryngeal; if one has to set up the root as PIE *√$h_1$ar, this would, of course, clearly confirm the morphological analysis by Hilmarsson (which would work at any rate). According to the teaching of the Leiden School, the Anatolian forms could nevertheless derive from PIE *$h_2$or-; see Kloekhorst, 2008, 198f. with ref.

ārsk- 'give up' → *ār⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cease'

āl⁽ᵃ⁾- '± ferngehalten werden', '± be restrained' (itr) (—)
        Prs IV — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *ololle* Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
Ger I *ololle* is attested in 227 b 3 and in PK AS 13E b 7: *krentaṃts̰ wṛattsaitse kartse k̰use yāṃṣaṃ mā tw ololle ////* "the one who is doing good to the good, is not to be restrained" (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).
Aɴᴛɪɢʀᴜɴᴅᴠᴇʀʙ + Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ II 'fernhalten, in Schach halten', 'keep away, hold in check' (tr) (m+/m/-)
        Prs IXb (m+) -,-, *ălastär*; — Imp —

nt-Part *alässeñca* (MQ)
m-Part —
Ger I *alaṣṣälle* (MQ) Abstr I —
Sub I (m) — Opt —; -,-, *ālyintär* (MQ)
      Ger II — Abstr II —
      Inf *āltsi*
Pt III in
PPt *ālu*
Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *(ā)l(astä)* is restored with some certainty in KVāc 17 a 3 by Schmidt, 1986, 49 (to be precise, he rather restores a Prs IXa form *(a)l(astä)*; but see my discussion in chap.s Sub IV 21.1.1. and Prs/Sub IX 31.1.4.2.). The nt-Part *alässeñca* is now also attested in another MQ text (THT 3972 b 4). The 3.pl.mid. *ālyintär* is analyzed (against the manuals) as Sub IV by Schmidt, 1975, 291f.; but see chap. Sub IV 21.1.1. Peyrot, 2008a, 92f. further restores a 3.sg. Opt *[al](y)[i](trä)* in IOL Toch 560 b 2 based on the Sanskrit parallel. Pace WTG, 122, § 120, fn. 5, the manuscript H 149.39 a 1 does not immediately break off after *ālu*; the text runs: *tāͧ maiyyasa maiyyāwä ālu kl ////*. Broomhead I, 189 restores *kl(eśanma)* and translates "The kleśas having been removed vigorously through this power of consideration". Sub I and Pt III belong to what I call an antigrundverb stem, while the Prs IXb in my definition belongs to a Kaus. II.

= ᴬ*āl⟮ä⟯?-* 'fernhalten, in Schach halten', 'keep away, hold in check' (tr) (m/-/m)
      Prs VIII (m) -, *āläṣtār*, *āläṣtär*;-,-, *ālsantär* Imp -,-, *ālṣāt*;—
          nt-Part —
          m-Part *āläsmāṃ*
          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf —
      Sub VII — Opt —
          Ger II *ālñäl* Abstr II — Priv —
      Pt III (m) -,-, *āltsāt*;—
      PPt *ālu*
      Ipv —

SEM. According to Schmidt, 1974, 498ff., there is no semantic reason to be found why the root is medium tantum. Schmidt does not mention the active form *alaṣṣäṃ* listed by Sieg/Siegling, TochSprR(B), glossary, 91, so apparently such an active form does not exist. For the semantics, see also Hilmarsson, 1991b, 166f. ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√h₂leu̯ 'fernhalten' (²LIV, 278), according to Hackstein, 1995, 215, who gets PT *āl- from PIE *h₂l̥- by deriving the (according to him non-existent) Sub IV from a present "*h₂lu̯-i̯e/o-", and the (according to me just within TA secondarily formed) TA Sub VII from a nasal present "*h₂l̥-n-u̯-i̯e/o-"; see further Adams, DoT, 54 with ref.

āl⟨ä⟩-sk- 'krank sein', 'be sick' (itr) (a+/-/-)
      Prs IXa (a+) -,-, *alāṣṣäṃ*;— Imp —

　　　　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　　　　m-Part *alāskemane*
　　　　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
　　　Sub IXa — Opt —
　　　　　　　　Ger II in *alāṣṣälletse* Abstr II — Priv —
　　　　　　　　Inf —
　　　Pt —
　　　PPt —
　　　Ipv —

ETYM. Hackstein, 1995, 248ff.; 1998, 226 based on Schmidt, 1982, 367 sets up an *-sḱe/o- present from PIE *√h₃elh₁ (²LIV, 298 'zugrunde gehen'); a different PIE root etymology is proposed by Adams, DoT, 25f.; recently Neri, 2007, 39ff. accepted the etymology by VW I, 620, who considered it to be based on a loan from Sanskrit (basing himself on Couvreur's connection with Skt. *alasa-* 'inactive, lazy, tired', which clearly underlies TA *ālās* 'lazy', which does not conform to the TA sound laws). As a matter of fact, *ālāsk-* can be derived from *ālāsäsk-*.

*ālp*ᵃ*-* 'darüber streichen, tasten', 'stroke, brush' (itr) (a/a/-)
　　　Prs VI (a) -,-, *ālpnān* (sic);-,-, *alpanaṃ* Imp —
　　　　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　　　　m-Part —
　　　　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
　　　Sub V (a) -,-, *ālpaṃ*;— Opt —
　　　　　　　　Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
　　　　　　　　Inf —
　　　Pt —
　　　PPt —
　　　Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *ālpnān* is attested in PK AS 7K a 2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 3.sg. Sub is also attested as MQ form *alpaṃ* in THT 1859 a [recte b] 2, and another MQ form *alpan* possibly in THT 1274 b 1 (M. Peyrot, p.c.).

= ᴬ*ālp*ᵃ*-* 'darüber streichen, tasten', 'stroke, brush' (itr) (-/-/m)
　　　Prs — Imp —
　　　　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　　　　m-Part —
　　　　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
　　　　　　　　Inf —
　　　Sub — Opt —
　　　　　　　　Ger II — Abstr II —
　　　Pt I (m) -,-, *ālpat*;—
　　　PPt —
　　　Ipv —

SEM. The meaning of the TA hapax in A 153 b 5 is certain: *lapā ālpat* "sie strich sich über den Kopf", cf. Schmidt, 1974, 285. The meaning "reflect" given by the

manuals for what seems to be the TB equivalent on the evidence of the passage 154 b 2 would differ immensely from that of TA. However, according to Winter (apud Carling, 2000, 304 with fn. 569) TB *ālpaṃ* attested in 154 b 2f. has actually the similar meaning 'stroke, scan': *mäkte orocce lyamne orkamotsai yaṣine meñantse ściriṃts läktsauña kos ālpaṃ warne entwe eṅtsi tot //// (mänt l)k(ā)ṣṣäṃ* "so wie das Licht des Mondes und der Sterne im großen See bei finsterer Nacht; wie oft man im Wasser tastet, um es [scil. das Licht] zu ergreifen, so oft (hat man keinen Erfolg) [und] (so) sieht man, (daß es eine Täuschung ist)" (similarly Thomas, 1969, 244, who speculates about a translation "darüber hinwegstreicht"). The context of the second attestation in H 149.14 b 2 is fragmentary. Broomhead I, 143, 145 translates here 'reflect': *//// t ṣemi tatākaṣ alpanaṃ kaṣ īwat[e]* "Some [have] become ...: [And] they reflect only anxiety"; Carling, l.c., does not offer an alternative translation, and it has to be admitted that 'touch, stroke' does not suggest itself in this passage. As for PK AS 7K a 2 *ālpnān*, we find again a construction with the Inf *eṅtsi* as in 154 b 3. Finally, *alpaṃ* in THT 1859 a [recte b] 2 (MQ) is likewise construed with a perlative: *sū tkentsa entwekka alpaṃ* "then he will brush over the earth (?)" (note that *tkentsa* 'over the earth' shows preservation of the original initial *t-* otherwise found in TA, which is in accordance with the archaic ductus of the manuscript). ETYM. See the discussion in Adams, DoT, 55.

ās- 'holen, hervorbringen', 'bring, fetch' (tr) (a/-/-)
        Prs IXa(/b?) (a) -,-, *āṣṣäṃ* (sic); — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub II — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *āṣtsi*
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv I (x) *pāsa;-|-; pasāt* (S)

The 3.sg. Prs *āṣṣäṃ* attested in 591 a 4 most likely comes from **āsäṣṣäṃ*; see WTG, 84, § 87,β, fn. 2, and since the passage is metrical, we may have to do with metrical *ä*-deletion; see Thomas, 1979, 178. According to WTG, 58, § 60, TEB II, 208, and Schmidt, 1974, 366f., the subjunctive stem and the imperative stem of this root function as suppletive stems for *pär-* 'carry'. ETYM. See Puhvel, 1991, 221, who rejects Kronasser's comparison with Hitt. *ḫaš(š)-*, *ḫeš(š)-* 'open'; similarly Kloekhorst, 2008, 322. Tremblay, 2005a, 434 accepts Van Windekens' Iranian etymology. Following the suggestion made in Adams, DoT, 58, one could try to derive the root from a preterit stem pre-PT **ō-(dō/a-)s-* (see also s.v. *wä(s)?-* 'give').

ās⁽ᵃ⁾- 'austrocknen, trocken werden', 'dry (out)' (itr) (m/-/a)
        Prs IV (m) -,-, *osotär;-,-, osontär* Imp —;-,-, *osīyentär*
                nt-Part —

       m-Part —
       Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub — Opt —
       Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
       Inf —
  Pt I (a) —;-,-, *asāre*
  PPt —
  Ipv —

The 3.pl. Imp *osīyentär* is probably attested in PK AS 14A.1 b 2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'austrocknen, trocken werden', 'dry (out)' (itr) (—)
  Prs — Imp —
       nt-Part —
       m-Part —
       Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub — Opt —
       Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
       Inf —
  Pt III in
  PPt *aswa*
  Ipv —

The intransitive PPt is attested in H 149.14 b 1: *aswa lymine* "dried out lips".

KAUSATIVUM II 'trocknen, trocken machen', 'make dry' (tr) (a/-/-)
  Prs IXb (a) -,-, *āsäṣṣäṃ* (S)/*āṣṣäṃ* (M);-,-, *āsäskeṃ* Imp —
       nt-Part *āsäṣṣeñca*
       m-Part —
       Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub — Opt —
       Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
       Inf —
  Pt —
  PPt —
  Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs *āsäskeṃ* is attested in PK AS 7M b 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). WTG, 222 analyzes *āṣṣäṃ* attested in the prose text 324 a 1 (M) as a 3.sg. Prs of this root, which was doubted by Couvreur, 1954, 89, and Thomas, 1979, 178, fn. 150 ("kaum") without further discussion. But judging by the medical context, a form of this root is not unlikely: 324 a 1 *sanāpa(tsi) kāntatsi lau päs āṣṣäṃ postanmeṃ träda* //// "Anointing [and] rubbing makes it dry away; afterwards ...". To be sure, *ä*-deletion is not expected in a prose text, but note that **-säsk- > (*)-sk-* could be even expected as a consequence of Klingenschmitt's rule (see chap. Sound Laws 1.1.).

= ᴬ*ās*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'austrocknen, trocken werden', 'dry (out)' (itr) (m/a/-)
  Prs IV (m) -,-, *asatär*;— Imp —
       nt-Part —
       m-Part —

> Ger I — Abstr I —
> Inf —

Sub V (a) -,-, *āsaṣ*;— Opt —
> Ger II — Abstr II *āslune*

Pt I in
PPt *āsu*
Ipv —

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'austrocknen (?)', '(make ?) dry' (?) (-/-/a)

Prs — Imp —
> nt-Part —
> m-Part —
> Ger I — Abstr I —
> Inf —

Sub — Opt —
> Ger II — Abstr II —

Pt III (a) -,-, *asäs*;—
PPt —
Ipv —

The once attested 3.sg. Pt TA *asäs* in A 45 b 3 is certainly Pt III, the valency is not so clear from the text itself, since we have: //// *ṣ tämyo asäs wär mo* ////. It is not impossible that TA *wär* starts a new sentence and is hence not the subject of TA *asäs*; otherwise, only intransitive "... therefore water dried out ..." would make sense. Since Tocharian B has an intransitive antigrundverb paradigm implied by the PPt *aswa*, however, I agree with Saito, 2006, 435 that it is likely that the TA intransitive PPt *āsu* forms an equation with TB †*āsu* (from PT *āsäwä) presupposed by *aswa* rather than goes back to a PT proto-form *āsāwä (which would be equally possible with respect to phonology), and furthermore guess that the whole antigrundverb paradigm of Tocharian A had intransitive semantics. The root ablaut of the TA antigrundverb *a*- in the 3.sg.act. vs. *ā*- in the PPt is, of course, of the same kind as the one found in the TB Sub I and Pt III of the antigrundverb paradigm from *ār*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'cease', i.e., reflects a PT root ablaut *å vs. *ā.

ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√h₂eh₁s '(durch Hitze) vertrocknen' (²LIV, 257f.), or rather PIE *√h₂es as set up by Ringe, 1991, 86; see also Adams, DoT, 58 with ref.

[*āsk-* 'sit', *aṣṣeñcai* read by Lévi, 1933 in U 18 a 1 is rather to be read *ṣmeñcai*, as already correctly done by Lévi/Meillet, 1913, 388; cf. Schmidt, 1974, 174, fn. 2.]

I

i- 'gehen', 'go' (itr) (a+/a/-)

Prs I + II (a+) *yam, yat, yaṃ; ynem/ynemo, yacer, yaneṃ*
> Imp *yaim, yait, yai/yey/yeyo* (MQ);
> *yeyem, yaicer, yeyeṃ/ yeṃ*

         nt-Part *yneñca*
         m-Part *ynemane*
         Ger I *yalle* Abstr I *yalñe*
Sub I + II (a) *yam, yat, yaṃ;-,-, yaneṃ* Opt —
         Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
         Inf *yatsi*
Pt —
PPt *yku | ykuweṣ*
Ipv VII (a) *paṣ, pcīso* (Š)/*cisso* (S)

The *nt*-Part *yneñca* is attested in PK AS 7K a 1 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The 1.pl. Imp *yeyem* and the 2.pl. Imp *yaicer* with the variant *yeycer* are only listed in TEB I, 217, § 392 without ref. *mä(s)ˀ-* 'go' provides the suppletive preterit. The *n*-extended stem variant *yän-* is almost always followed by the thematic vowel *-e-* (but cf. also the derivative *ynūca* 'going', which presupposes an underlying PPt †*ynu* and above all *ynamo* 'going', which clearly attests to an athematic stem PT *yänä-), and its use certainly "allows the differentiation of first and third person plural from the corresponding singular forms", as per Adams, DoT, 61.

= ᴬ*i-* 'gehen', 'go' (itr) (a+/-/-)
         Prs I (a+) *yäm, yät, yäṣ; ymäs, yäc, yiñc/yäñc*
                  Imp *yem, yet, yeṣ;-,-, yeñc*
                  nt-Part —
                  m-Part *ymāṃ*
                  Ger I *yäl* Abstr I —
                  Inf *ytsi*
         Sub — Opt —
                  Ger II — Abstr II —
         Pt —
         PPt —
         Ipv VII (a) *piṣ; pic/picäkk* (YQ)/*piś/picäs; pines* (YQ)

The other stems are supplied by ᴬ*kälk-* 'go'. Schmidt, 1999b, 282 claims that instead of TA *t⌐ukär yät*, one has to read TA *t⌐ukäryät* in A 215 b 2, for which he then sets up a root ᴬ*t⌐ukäry-* 'zugrunde gehen' by referring to a still unpublished article of his; but that new root would have a quite suspicious shape. Formally, a PPt TA °*inu* is probably attested in TA *maltow-inu* 'first', cf. Winter, 1992, 132f.; 2003, 204. On the 2.pl. Ipv variant TA *piś* (for TA *pic*) 'let us go' used "im Sinn der 1. Pl." in A 340 a 3, see Sieg, Übers. II, 37, fn. 4; on the informal/eastern sound change *-c#* > *-ś#*, see Schmidt, 1986a, 642. For a diachronic explanation of the imperative forms, see chap. Ipv 37.7.1.

SEM. Although basically intransitive, as a verb of motion it can be construed with an obliquus of direction; see Thomas, 1983, 12ff. ETYM. Of course from PIE *√h₁ei̯ 'go' (²LIV, 232f.) As for the stem allomorph pre-TB *yänä/æ-, Pedersen, 1941, 160, fn. 1 was the first to connect it with Latin, Lithuanian, and Hittite present forms made from the same root also showing *-n-* (Lat. *-īnunt* [on which see now de Vaan, 2008, 192], Modern Lith. *einù*, Hitt. *i-i̯a-an-na-i* [on the latter see now Jasanoff, 2003, 122ff.]), and was followed by Krause,

1951, 162f. (cf. WTG, 61, § 63; TEB I, 198, § 353) and G. Schmidt, 1984, 226f.; quite differently, Klingenschmitt, 1975, 158, fn. 12 = 2005, 142, fn. 12 ("*ynem* [...] ist eine Analogiebildung zur 3. Plural *yaneṃ* < *ịän-an* ["*"ịän*" itself according to Klingenschmitt being the outcome of the PIE 3.pl. ""*ə̯ient*"]), followed by Kim, 2009a, 55, fn. 17; note that to judge from *ynamo*, *yaneṃ* should be assumed to have replaced a more archaic pre-TB *yänän. As for the PPt *yku*, Adams, DoT, 61 claims the -*k*- is owed to an inherited root variant in *-gʰ- (found in Gk. οἴχομαι 'be gone', etc.); I think one would rather prefer the idea that *yänäwä (presupposed by *ynūca* 'going') had been replaced rather recently by *yäkäwä under the influence of some semantically related verbal stem ending in -*k*-, but I have to admit that there are no such other verbal stems in Tocharian B that one could call obvious candidates for having acted as source.

iyᴮ- 'einherfahren', 'führen', 'go, travel', 'lead, cause to go' (itr/tr) (a/a/-)
      Prs V (a) -,-, *iyaṃ*; — Imp -,-, *īyoy*; —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub V (a) —;-,-, *iyaṃ* Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —
The present is often attested in caravan travel passports (see Pinault, 1987, 190).
= *ᴬyᴮ-* 'einherfahren', 'go, travel' (itr) (m/-/a)
      Prs X (m) *ynāsmār*,-,-; — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt I (a) -,-, *yā*; —
      PPt *yāyo*
      Ipv —
For the present form TA *ynāsmār*, see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 36ff. with fn. 12: "the formation would follow the pattern of the verbs of movement, cf. *käl-nāsk-* (> B *källāṣṣäṃ*) for the verb *käl-* 'to bring'".
Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from a reduplicated PIE present stem *ịi-ị(e)h₂- from *√ịeh₂ 'dahinziehen, fahren' (²LIV, 309f.); see Hackstein, 1995, 23, fn. 26 and 27, followed by ²LIV, and Adams, DoT, 66. Since TB *iyā-*, which is only attested in the active voice, can function as its own causative, I would prefer deriving *yäyā- from (the instr.sg. of) a verbal abstract *h₁(i)ịeh₂- '(with) going'.

E

ᴬe- 'give' → *ai-* 'id.'

eṅk- 'ergreifen, annehmen, halten, begreifen', 'seize, take, understand'
    (tr) (m+/m/m)
    Prs IXa (m+) *eṅkaskemar, eṅkastar, eṅkastär;*
        eṅkaskemtär,-, eṅkaskentär
        Imp -,-, *eṅkaṣṣitär;—*
        nt-Part *eṅkaṣṣeñca*
        m-Part *eṅkaskemane*
        Ger I *eṅkaṣle* Abstr I —
    Sub I (m) -,-, *eṅktär/eṅtär;-,-, eṅkantär* (sic)
        Opt *eñcīmar, eñcitar, eñcītär;—*
        Ger II *eṅkälle* Abstr II *eṅkalñe* (sic) Priv —
        Inf *eṅktsi/eṅtsi*
    Pt III (m) *eṅksamai/eṅsamai, eṅsatai, eṅksate/eṅsate;*
        eṅksamte,-, eṅsante
    PPt *eṅku| eṅkoṣ*
    Ipv III (x) *peṅksa/peṅsa;-| peṅsar, peṅksat*

The 1.sg. Prs *eṅkaskemar* and the *nt*-Part are often attested in KVāc, the 2.sg. Prs *eṅkastar* is found in KVac 24 a 4 (Schmidt, 1986, 56), the 2.pl. Ipv *peṅksat* in KVāc 9 a 1 (Schmidt, 1986, 42), and the 3.sg. Imp *eṅkaṣṣitär* in PK AS 16.3 b 6 (Pinault, 1989a, 157). The *m*-Part *(eṅka)(s)[k](e)mane* is to be restored in H 149.144 a 4 (cf. Broomhead I, 111). The 1.sg. Pt *eṅksamai* is attested in the business document PK Cp 8 b 2 (Pinault, 1994b, 107; 2008, 372), the 2.sg. Pt *e[ṅ]s(a)[t](ai)* in PK AS 12E a 1 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 2.sg. Pt *eṅ[s]a(tai)* in THT 3597 a 5 (MQ text, cf. also the translation in Schmidt, 1983, 272), the 1.pl. Pt *eṅksa[m]te* in the business document PK LC XXXVII, 22 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), and the PPt *eṅkoṣ*, e.g., in 199 b 3. The form *eñci* in 240 a 2 can also be analyzed as a verbal adjective instead of a 3.sg.act. Opt, and since such an Opt would be the only attestation of an active form (cf. Schmidt, 1974, 24, fn. 3), the analysis as a verbal adjective is preferable; on the formation see Malzahn, in print. The accent of the Sub I is uncertain.

~ *ᴬeṃts⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'ergreifen, annehmen, halten, begreifen', 'seize, take, understand'
    (tr) (m+/m/m)
    Prs VIII (m+) *eṃtsäsmār, eṃtsäṣtār, eṃtsäṣtär;-,-, eṃtssantär* Imp —
        nt-Part *eṃtssant*
        m-Part —
        Ger I *etsṣäl* Abstr I —
        Inf *eṃtsässi*
    Sub V (m) *eṃtsmār/eṃtsāmār,-, eṃtsatär/eṃtsātär;*
        etsaṃmtär,-, entsantär
        Opt -,-, *eṃtsitär;-,-, entsintär*

Ger II *entsāl-yo* Abstr II *eṃtsālune/eṃtsālne*
Pt I/III (m) *eṃtse, entsāte, eṃtsāt;-,-, entsānt*
PPt *eṃtsu*
Ipv I/III (m) *peṃtsār; pentsāc*

Pace Hackstein, 1995, 327, I analyze the present as a Class VIII one instead of Class XI; see the discussion in chap. Prs XI. The *nt*-Part TA *eṃtsṣant* is attested in THT 1473 a 3. According to TEB I, 244, § 438,3, fn., the TA preterit has to be analyzed as Class I "vom toch. Standpunkt aus", which is nevertheless "möglicherweise aus *eṃts-s-āt* entstanden". The fact that there is no weakening by vowel balance (TA *eṃtsāt* instead of †*eṃtsat*) speaks in favor of an analysis as a Pt III; see chap. Pt I 7.2.2.

Kausativum III/IV '?' (tr) (-/a/-)

Prs — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
    Inf —
Sub IX (a) — Opt -,-, *entsṣiṣ;* —
    Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The context of the hapax TA *entsṣiṣ* in A 421 a 3 is very fragmentary, so its meaning cannot be determined, but the form seems at least to be transitive.

Sem. For the passive forms, see Hackstein, 1995, 223f. Etym. PIE *√h₁neḱ 'erhalten, nehmen' (²LIV, 250f.). As convincingly argued by Hackstein, 1995, 224ff., and 1998, 223ff., the Tocharian root is to be derived from the zero grade of the root, i.e., PIE *h₁n̥ḱ- (or maybe *h₂n̥ḱ-), that is, the subjunctive stem of TB is to be derived from a PIE zero-grade middle root aorist, whereas the present stem and preterit stem are inner-Tocharian formations. The TA root is not a loan from TB (thus VW I, 179f.), but reflects *aṅks- > *ans- > *aⁱns- > TA *eṃts-*; see Hilmarsson, 1987d, 71ff. with ref., based on Winter, 1961a, 272 = 1984, 68 = 2005, 37. As for the *s*-extension, Adams, DoT, 78 takes *enks- to reflect "generalization of the preterit stem"; differently Hilmarsson, 1987b, 55, fn. 5, who gets the *-s-* from a present stem in *-s-*, cf. also Hilmarsson, 1987d, 71ff. with ref. to the type TA *kñasäṣt* and TA "*swasäṣt*", which he both analyzes as Prs XI stems, i.e., formations with the suffix *-säs-. The TA Prs XI suffix is, however, *-sis-*, and TA *kñasäṣt* is a preterit form; as for the alleged TA "*swasäṣt*", this form has to be restored differently; see s.v. ᴬ*suw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'rain'. As a matter of fact, the most likely solution is to explain the TA Sub as due to a reanalysis of the *s*-preterit as an *ā*-preterit, and this analysis is clearly backed by non-syncopated forms such as TA *eṃtsāmār* and TA *eṃtsālune* that point to Pt III-type preforms with *-käsā-; precisely the former presence of *-äs- also explains the fact that the TA preterit itself does not show vowel balance; the same kind of reanalysis happened in TA in the case of ᴬ*wäs-* 'don'.

en- 'unterweisen, anordnen', 'instruct' (tr) (m+/m/m)

        Prs IXb (m+) -,-, *enästär;-,-, enäskentär* Imp -,-, *enäṣṣitär;—*

               nt-Part *enäṣṣeñca*

               m-Part *enäskemane* (MQ)/*enäṣṣemāne* (MQ)

               Ger I *enäṣlyi* Abstr I —

        Sub IXb (m) -,-, *enastar-c* (sic);— Opt —

               Ger II — Abstr II *enäṣṣälyñe* Priv —

               Inf —

        Pt IV (m) -,-, *enṣṣate-me* (Š);-,-, *enäṣṣānte* (MQ)

        PPt —

        Ipv —

3.sg. Prs *enästrä* is attested in PK AS 18B a 3 (Pinault, 1984, 376; 2008, 77), 3.pl. Prs *enäskenträ* in PK AS 18B a 5 (Pinault, 2008, 77), and 2.sg. Sub *enas[t]a(r-c)* in KVāc 17 b 3 (Schmidt, 1986, 50). *enäṣṣälyñe* is analyzed as Abstr II, because abstracts of this kind are generally derived from the subjunctive rather than from the present stem.

~ *ᴬen-* 'unterweisen, anordnen, beherrschen, bestrafen', 'instruct, rule, punish'

        (tr) (—)

        Prs VIII — Imp —

               nt-Part —

               m-Part *enäsmāṃ* 'instructing'

               Ger I — Abstr I —

               Inf *enässi* 'rule'

        Sub VII — Opt —

               Ger II — Abstr II *eñlune* 'advice'

        Sub IX — Opt —

               Ger II — Abstr II *enäṣlune* 'order'

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv IV (m) *peṃṣār;-* 'punish!' (?)

Sᴇᴍ. The range of meaning in TA is wider than that in TB. The Inf TA *(enä)ssi* in A 256 a 3f. (the restoration is certain) has the meaning 'rule, govern'; see Thomas, 1969, 256 and see now also the new edition of the text by Geng/Laut/Pinault, 2004a, 55. The asigmatic abstract TA *eñlune* is a hapax, but one can nevertheless rule out a simple misspelling of sigmatic TA *enäṣlune* (which is attested at least eight times), because the forms also differ semantically: TA *enäṣlune* means 'order, rule, instruction' (A 342 b [= a] 2; A 343 a 2 'order' (written TA *enaṣlune*); A 353 a 6, b 4; A 354 a 3, b 5, b 6 'rule, instruction'; the fragmentary passage A 131 b 3 is unclear), whereas TA *eñlune* in A 11 a 5 means 'advice' (cf. Lane, 1947, 47; to be sure, the German translation 'Anweisung' by Sieg, Übers. I, 14 is deceptive in this respect). The meaning 'punish' is apparently attested in A 256 a 4: TA *pyām yärk krañcäśśi peṃṣār ykoñcä(s)* "Bezeuge den Guten Verehrung [und] strafe die Pflichtvergessenen!"; see Geng/Laut/Pinault, 2004a, 55. The range of meaning in TA is thus the same as that of Skt. √śās 'punish, rule, order, instruct'; in TB, the verb most often means 'instruct' (with respect to Buddhist teaching).

Eтym. Most scholars assume a loan, either from TA into TB, or vice versa; see the ref. in Adams, DoT, 82. But according to Winter, 1977, 145f. = 1984, 190f. = 2005, 182, followed by Hilmarsson, 1987b, 49ff., TB *e-* and TA *e-* can indeed be traced back to a common PT ancestor form *æn- under the assumption of a TA *i*-epenthesis turning pre-TA *an- into *ayn- > *en-* (which, however, requires the former existence of pre-TA *an-s- instead of *anäs-). Hilmarsson, 1987b, 52ff. and 1991a, 71f. analyzes the stem *æn-äsk- as an old kausativum of *eṅk-* 'seize', *sk*-less TA *eñlune* reflecting *æṅk-ñä-l°. Melchert (apud Adams, DoT, 82) posits a "remade causative of the *moneō* type" *h₁onH-ei̯e/o-. If one is willing to set up as basic meaning 'impose, lay on, charge', a perfect match will be provided, at least semantically, by Hitt. *ḫann(a)-*, which according to Puhvel, 1991, 83, had the same proto-meaning; note that possibly related Lyc. *qãti*, *qãñti* (taking on deities as subjects), again as per Puhvel, seems to denote 'call to account, punish'. Because of Lyc. *q-*, the root would be best set up as *√h₂enH with *h₂-; and since at least in an inherited *sk*-formation one would expect a zero grade rather than an *o*-grade, *h₂n̥H- would furnish counterevidence to 'Lex Rix' in Tocharian as set up by Hackstein, 1998, 217ff.; differently on these Hittite and Lycian verbs now Kloekhorst, 2008, 283f., who rather wants to connect the Toch. root again with Hitt. *annanu-* 'train, educate' (2008, 177; cf. Adams, DoT, 82).

en-äsk- 'instruct' → *en-* 'id.'

[**eṃs(s)-**, there seems to be a hapax *eṃssalñe* in 361 b 6 (M), but the word separation is uncertain, as per TochSprR(B) s.v.; see also Couvreur, 1954, 91.]

ᴬ**eṃts⁽ᵃ⁾-** 'seize' → *eṅk-* 'id.'

ᴬ**ep-** 'cover → *aip-* 'id.'

er- 'hervorrufen', 'evoke, cause' (tr) (x/x/m)
        Prs VIII (x) -,-, *erṣäṃ;-,-, erseṃ* | -,-, *erṣtär;-,-, ersentär*
               Imp —;-,-, *erṣyentär*
               nt-Part *erṣeñca*
               m-Part —
               Ger I *erṣalle* Abstr I —
        Sub I (x) *ermar, ertar, ertär;-,-, erntär/eräntär* (MQ)
               Opt -,-, *eri;—* | *erimar, eritar, eritär;—*
               Ger II *erlona* Abstr II *erälyñe* (sic) Priv —
               Inf *ertsi*
        Pt III (m) *ersamai, ersatai, ersate;-,-, ersante*
        PPt *eru* | *eroṣ*
        Ipv III (m) *persar; persat*
The 1.sg.mid. Sub *ermar* is attested in THT 1419 frg. f b 2, the 3.sg.mid. Sub *ertär* in THT 3198 b 1: //// *mrauskallaññe mā ertra* • "would not evoke

aversion against the world"; a remarkable 3.pl.mid. *erntär* with *-ränt-* > *-rnt-* can be found in THT 1581 b 2. The 3.sg.mid. Imp *erṣitär* listed in TEB I, 223, § 402,2, is probably only reconstructed. The Abstr II *erälyñesa* is attested in KVāc 24 a 3 (Schmidt, 1986, 56), and also in the small fragment THT 1363 frg. d a 3; both this form and *erntär* attest to persistent initial accent in the Sub I. A 1.pl.mid. Opt *[e](riyemträ)* is further restored by TochSprR(B) in 184, 2. The obl. PPt *eroṣ* is attested four times (PK AS 17G a 2, PK AS 13E a 5, both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; THT 2959 a 4; IOL Toch 915 a 2; see Tamai, 2007 and 2007a, s.v.), the Ipv 2.sg.mid. *persar* in THT 3596 b 1.

= ᴬ*ar-* 'hervorrufen', 'evoke, bring forth' (tr) (x/m/x)

         Prs VIII (x) -, *aräṣt, aräṣ;-,-, arseñc* | -, *aräṣtär, aräṣtär;-,-, arsantär*

             Imp —
             nt-Part *arṣäntāñ*
             m-Part —
             Ger I *arṣäl* Abstr I —
             Inf *arässi*

         Sub VII (m) —;-,-, *arñantar* Opt *arñīmār,-, arñitär;*—

             Ger II *arñäl* Abstr II *aräñlune*

         Pt III (x) *arwā,-,-;* — | -,-, *arsāt;-,-, arsānt*
         PPt *aru*
         Ipv III (m) *parsār; parsāc*

The 3.sg.mid. Sub TA *aräñtar* (sic) in A 366 a 1 found together with the preverb TA *lo* 'away' rather belongs to ᴬ*ār⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cease' despite its initial; see s.v. ᴬ*ār⁽ᵃ⁾-*. Couvreur, 1949a, 32 proposes to restore an (active) subjunctive form TA *(arñä)[ṣ]* in A 9 b 6f. instead of a present form (thus Sieg, Übers. I, 13, fn. 1), because of the conjunction TA *penu*. 3.sg.mid. Opt *arñitär* is attested in the small fragment THT 1645 frg. c a 3 (Carling, DThTA, s.v. *ar-*).

Eᴛʏᴍ. PIE *√h₃er 'sich in Bewegung setzen' (²LIV, 299ff.); see Hackstein, 1995, 47ff., and 1998, 227ff. with fn. 23.

AI

ai- act. 'geben', 'give', mid. 'nehmen', 'take' (tr) (a+/x/-)

         Prs IXa (a+) *aiskau, aista-ne, aiṣṣäṃ; aiskem, aiścer, aiskeṃ*

             Imp -,-, *aiṣṣi;-,-, aiṣṣiyeṃ* / *aiṣyeṃ*
             nt-Part *aiṣṣeñca*
             m-Part *aiskemane*
             Ger I *aiṣälle* / *aiṣle* Abstr I —

         Sub I (x) *āyu* / *ayu-ne, ait, aiṃ; -,-, aiṃ* | *aimar,-, aitär;*—

             Opt -,-, *ayi-ne;* — | -,-, *ayītär;*—
             Ger II *aille* Abstr II *ailñe* Priv *anāyätte*
             Inf *aitsi* / *aissi* / *aisi* / *aistsi*

         Pt III in

            PPt *āyoṣ*
            Ipv —

A 2.sg. Prs *aista-ne* is attested in a letter kept in Regional Museum of the Province of Xinjiang in Ürümqi (see Schmidt, 1997, 235f.; the text hails from Maralbashi, reading verified by G.-J. Pinault, p.c., the inventory number is 59 B.T. A 7-50; on the ending see chap. Endings 3.2.1.2.). TochSprR(B) proposes a restoration of a 1.pl. Sub *(aiy)m(o)* in 295 a 2 (followed by TEB II, 61, no. XXII, 2). TochSprR(B) further restores a middle present *(aiske)nträ kauc* in 521 b 2; see also Sieg, 1938, 19, who translates "(versprechen?) sie laut". The Imp variant *aiṣyeṃ* is attested in THT 1210 b 1, the 1.sg.mid. Sub *aimar* in the small fragment THT 1578 frg. b b 1 (without context), and the 3.sg.mid. Sub *(päst) aitär* in 318 b 1 and H 149.73 a 1. The infinitive variants *aisi, aissi,* and *aistsi* are all found in monastery records (G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The subjunctive stem is athematic; see Hackstein, 1995, 151f., fn. 7 and 252ff. *wä(s)ʔ-* 'give' provides the suppletive finite preterit stem, but the PPt (at least in TB) seems to be formed from *ai-* as well, to judge from a nom.pl. PPt *āyoṣ* attested in PK Bois B 74 (see Pinault, 1994b, 99), and from the Abs *āyormeṃ* and the noun *āyor* 'gift'. The associated imperative forms 2.sg. *pete*, 2.pl. *petso/petes* are synchronically opaque; see chap. Ipv 37.6. The Prs IX goes back to PT *āyäsk- and not *āysk-; see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.6.2.1.

= ᴬ***e-*** 'geben', 'give' (tr) (a+/a/-)
            Prs VIII (a+) *esam, eṣt, eṣ;-,-, eseñc* Imp -,-, *eṣā;-,-, eṣār*
                        nt-Part *eṣant*
                        m-Part *esmāṃ*
                        Ger I *eṣäl* Abstr I —
                        Inf *essi*
            Sub I + II (a) *em, et, eṣ;-,-, āyeñc* Opt *āyim, āyit, āyiṣ; āyimäs,-,-*
                        Ger II *el* Abstr II *elune*
            Pt —
            PPt —
            Ipv —

The subjunctive class is strictly speaking ambiguous, but should basically be athematic, while the thematic 3.pl. ending must have been introduced analogically; see Hackstein, 1995, 151f., fn. 7, and 252ff., and chap. Sub I/V. ᴬ*wä(s)ʔ-* 'give' provides the suppletive preterit stem and PPt. The imperative forms 2.sg. *paṣ*, 2.pl. *pac* are synchronically opaque; see chap. Ipv 37.6. SEM. In TB, the middle of the subjunctive as well as the infinitive can have the meaning 'take' and thus provide the suppletive forms for *pär-* 'carry, take'; see Schmidt, 1974, 61f. and 360ff.; 1984, 152; Hackstein, 1995, 252. ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√h₂eị̯ 'give' (possibly rather *√h₁aị̯; Adams, DoT, 100 sets up "PIE *h₄ei-").

aik- 'wissen, erkennen', 'know, recognize' (tr) (m+/m/x)
            Prs II (m+) *aikemar, aiśtar, aiśtär;-,-, aikentär* Imp *aiśimar,-,-; —*
                        nt-Part *aiśeñca*
                        m-Part *aikemane*

                    Ger I *aiśalle* Abstr I —
          Sub II (m) — Opt -,-, *aiśitär,* —
                    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                    Inf *aiśtsi/aistsi/aiśtsi/aissi*
          Pt III (x) -, *ekasta* (sic),-; — | -, *aiksātaiy* (MQ),-; -,-, *aiksante*
          PPt *aiku* | *aikoṣ*
          Ipv —

A 3.sg. Opt *(ai)ś(i)tär* is restored in 305 a 1 by TochSprR(B). On the only active
form, i.e., 2.sg. Pt *ekasta* in 204 b 3, see Schmidt, 1986, 142 against WTG, 226.
Hilmarsson, 1991, 98ff. correctly argues that the privative *anaikte* 'unnoticed'
(N.B. not 'ignorant'!) attests to a former Sub I stem, which is a perfect match
for the Pt III. It has been claimed that some forms of the paradigm show
causative semantics, but I do not think with reason. The 2.sg. Pt *aiksātaiy* in
214 a 2f. was taken for a causative by TEB I, 250, § 445, followed by
Hilmarsson, 1991, 101: *aiyksātaiy ra saṃsārṣṣana po (läkle)nta • cämpmo no
ṣaiyt nauwṣai klāwastsi saṃsārmeṃ twe* "you have also made known all the
pains of Saṃsāra, for you were able to report previous (events) from the
Saṃsāra" (translation by Hilmarsson); however, W. Winter (p.c.) proposes the
following translation: "as you had come to know all the pains of the Saṃsāra,
you are able to report previous (events) from the Saṃsāra". Based on his
claim, Hilmarsson, 1991, 101ff. also interpreted the other *s*-preterit forms of
this verb as causatives, but these may rather denote 'know' as well, cf.
Schmidt, 1986, 103 for KVāc 31 a 5f.: *ce po saṃsā(rṣṣi onolmi) //// po śarsa •
ce ṣpä po saṃsārṣṣi onolmi mā aiksante ////* "Alles, was (die) Saṃsāra(-
Wesen zu [ihrer] Erleuchtung brauchten, das) alles wußte er. Und alles, was
die Saṃsāra-Wesen nicht wußten, (das alles lehrte er sie)". The same is true
for *ekasta* in 204 b 3: *pernerñesa ekasta eṅkalñeṣṣeṃ ñemna po*: "Through
your glory you know all the names of attachment". ETYM. To be derived from
*√Heiḱ̑ 'sich aneignen' (²LIV, 223); Adams, DoT, 101f.

aip- 'bedecken', 'cover' (tr) (a/-/a)
          Prs VIII (a) —;-,-, *aiypseṃ* Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I *aipṣalle* Abstr I —
          Sub — Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                    Inf —
          Pt III (a) —;-,-, *aipar-ne*
          PPt *aipu* | *aipoṣ*
          Ipv —

Although the manuscript 598 b 2 reads *aiṣṣalle*, TochSprR(B), s.v., fn. 14
correctly suspects a copyist's error for †*aipṣalle* (the signs ⟨ṣa⟩ and ⟨pa⟩ being
very similar), which is supported by the fact that the form is constructed with

the preposition *śār* 'over', which is precisely found together with a form from *aip-* in 560, 3. The obl. PPt *aipoṣ* is, e.g., attested in 211 a 4.

= *^Aep-* 'bedecken', 'cover' (tr) (-/-/x)

Prs — Imp —
  nt-Part —
  m-Part —
  Ger I — Abstr I —
  Inf —
Sub — Opt —
  Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt III (x) -,-, *epsā-ñi*; — | -,-, *epsāt*; —
PPt *epu*
Ipv —

A 1.sg. Pt TA *epā* is probably attested in the small fragment THT 2043 b 3, according to Carling, DThTA, s.v. *ep-*. Etym. The root most certainly has non-A-character; the etymology remains uncertain.

aiw^(ā)- 'zugewandt sein, sich zuwenden', 'be turned toward, incline to' (itr) (m/-/a)

Prs IV (m) -,-, *aiwotär*; -,-, *aiwontär-ne* Imp —
  nt-Part —
  m-Part —
  Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —
  Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
  Inf —
Pt I (a) -,-, *aiwā-ne*; —
PPt *aiwau*
Ipv —

A 3.pl. Prs *(ai)wontär-ne* is restored in 159 a 2 by TochSprR(B).

Antigrundverb + Kausativum II 'zuwenden', 'turn to' (tr) (m/m/-)

Prs IXb (m) -,-, *aiwästär*; — Imp —
  nt-Part —
  m-Part —
  Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub I/II (m) — Opt -,-, *aiwītär-ñ*; —
  Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
  Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

A kausativum Prs IXb *aiwästär* is listed in TEB II, 174 without ref. The 3.sg. Opt *aiwītär-ñ* is attested in PK AS 17I + NS 77.1 b 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.): *śaul aiwītar-ñä̀ ce᷅u preke srukalñeś* "my life shall be turned towards death at that moment". Etym. A-character is

reconstructed with certainty. According to Hilmarsson, 1991, 125ff.; 1996, 3f., we are dealing with a denominative based on *æn *y(ä)wā 'in sympathy' → *æywā > *āiwā (→ subjunctive stem). In this respect, the root could be related to *ᴬyu⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'seek, aspire, incline towards', cf. also Adams, DoT, 105 and 502. Pace the manuals, I believe that a similar root *yu-* 'seek, aspire, turn toward' is also attested in TB; see s.v. *yu-*. As a matter of fact, a verbal root with a root vowel *æ should rather have formed a Prs III than Prs IV. Accordingly, we better start with a *u̯o*-adjective derived from the Tocharian root *ai-* 'give', which first meant 'given', and then took on the meaning 'inclined to' (cf. Engl. expressions such as 'given to drinking'). To judge from *aiwol* 'towards', the whole paradigm was probably based on a respective adjective abstract in *-eh₂- 'givenness'; see chap. PPt 14.2.

O

ᴬok- '?' → *auk-* '± set in motion'

ᴬoks- 'grow' → *auks-* 'id.'

ᴬo(-n)- 'hit, begin' → *au-n-* 'id.'

or- 'give up' → *ār⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'cease'

AU

auk- '± in Bewegung setzen', '± set in motion' (tr) (-/x/-)
      Prs — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub I (x) -,-, *ewkän-me* (MQ); — Opt *ewśim* (MQ),-,-; — | *auśimar*,-,-; —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —
Schmidt, 1985, 431f. sets up a 3.sg. Sub I *ewkän-me* from a root *auk-* on the basis of 274 b 5, where he proposes a word separation different from the one adopted in TochSprR(B): 274 b 4f. *śāmnā śänmeṃ maittreyeṃśc po śaiṣṣentse //// saṃtkewkänmonwāññe läṃ saṃsārṣṣe pelemeṃ* "wenn die Menschen ... zu Maitreya [...] kommen, [so] wird er ihnen das Amṛta-Heilmittel zuteil werden lassen(?) (bzw. zu trinken geben(?)), [und] sie werden aus dem Saṃsāra-Gefängnis herausgehen". According to Schmidt, 2007, 323, the respective 1.sg. Opt *ewśim* is attested in THT 1540 frg. f + g a 4 (first

mentioned by its old pencil number apud Hackstein, 1995, 337, fn. 29 and 339): //// *[ka̱]llo ⸗m perne ñäṣ̌ ewśi*[frg. g]*[m] s(aṃ)tk(e) onwäññe* (*po wnolmeṃ*) //// "Ich möchte die [Buddha]würde erlangen [und] (allen Wesen) das Amr̥ta-Heilmittel zu trinken geben".

= ᴬ*ok-* '± in Bewegung setzen', '± set in motion' (tr) (-/a/-)

       Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
       Sub VII (a) -,-, *okñäṣ;* — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

SEM./ETYM. The manuals rather list a root *auk-* 'aufwachsen, zunehmen' (WTG, 226), but Schmidt, 1985, 431f., and Hackstein, 1995, 336ff. have shown that the respective Toch. root of that meaning is to be set up with a root-final -*s*-, i.e., as *auks-* 'grow'; see below. As for the *s*-less forms subsumed under an *s*-less root *auk-* 'aufwachsen' by the manuals, Schmidt, l.c., and Hackstein, l.c., argue that they are either ghost forms, or belong to a root *auk-* with a different meaning. As for the alleged Sub II *aukeṃ* in 364 a 2, Couvreur's proposal (1954, 83, followed by Schmidt, 1985, 431; Hackstein, 1995, 338 with fn. 31) to read *saññaukeṃ* is indeed to be preferred over reading *sañ ̃ aukeṃ.* As for the 2.sg. Sub V *aukat* (listed with a question mark in WTG, l.c.) in 516 b 4 (a text with MQ character; see Adaktylos et al., 2007, 41), Schmidt, 1974, 48f., 3, followed by Hackstein, 1995, 338, doubts that *[au]katsāmat* "in undurchsichtigem Kontext" is to be separated into two 2.sg. forms *aukat tsāmat*, which is what TochSprR(B), s.v., fn. 8 proposed; actually neither of the two verbal stems *aukā-* and *tsāmā-* is attested otherwise. The interpretation of this passage remains totally unclear, although it must be admitted that a verbal form of the 2.sg. would fit the context. Finally, TEB I, 216, § 387 lists an Inf *aukatsi* without reference. Hackstein, 1995, 338, fn. 31 wonders whether this form was simply based on "einer anderen Trennung desselben Komplexes [i.e., *aukatsāmat* in 516 b 4] in *aukats(i)=āmat*?". To be sure, such an Inf is found neither in the Paris, nor in the Berlin collections, as far as these are accessible to me at present. As for the certain attestations of *auk-/*ᴬ*ok-*, there is just a single one in TA: A 217 a 4f. *wärpā(t ā)ksissi krañcäṃ märkampal māryu praṣṭaṃ okñäṣ ñäktas napenäs säm oṅkraci* "{Der Buddha} hat eingewilligt zu lehren das gute Gesetz, in nicht langer Zeit wird er Götter und Menschen die Unsterblichkeit ..." (as edited and translated by Sieg/Siegling, 1933, 168, with the guess "erlangen lassen?" for the verbal form in question in fn. 5). Note that Schmidt on various occasions has claimed that TA *oṅkraci* 'immortality' is here to be translated as 'elixir of immortality', because he wants the root *auk-/*ᴬ*ok-* to have the meaning 'zu trinken geben, trinken lassen' (Schmidt, 1985, 431f.; apud Hackstein, 1995, 344; and most

recently 2007, 333f.; cf. also Couvreur, 1956, 71). In TB, the three relevant passages are less clear with respect to semantics. S 8 b 2f. *tsmoytär-ñ nete pälskoṣṣe aṅklautka(t)te //// (kä)lloym onwaññe pelaikneṣe auśimar piś cmelaṣṣem* (text according to Thomas, 1966a, 180, who in fn. 10 proposes to restore *(yoktsi kä)lloym* "möchte ich (zu trinken) erlangen den Gesetzes-Nektar") is a metrical passage, and has to be subdivided as follows: S 8 b 2f. (5) – – *(kä)lloym onwaññe | pelaikneṣe auśimar | piś cmelaṣṣem*. Of course, it would also be possible to restore disyllabic *sāṃtke* (which shows up in the other attestations of the root in TB; see below). The point of the passage in question evidently is that the poet not only wishes to gain some benefit through composing the Udānastotra, but by doing so also wants to make the dharma known to others who are still attached to the Saṃsāra (= the cycle of the five kinds of rebirth), so that they may be freed from it. In this respect, Hackstein's interpretation of the passage makes good sense (1995, 340): "Erlangen möchte ich den (Unsterblichkeits-) Nektar des Gesetzes und [ihn] gedeihen lassen den Fünfgeburten-Wesen" (probably 'angedeihen' is intended). 274 (MQ) is also a metrical text in stanzas consisting of 4x14 syllables (7|7, 4-3-4-3), line b 4f. runs: *śāmnā śänmeṃ maittreyeṃśc | po śaiṣṣentse (saim wästeśc|) (ce) saṃtk=ewkänm=onwaññe | läṃ saṃsārṣṣe pelemeṃ* as restored by Schmidt, 1985, 432, who translates "Wenn die Menschen ... zu Maitreya, (dem Schutz [und] Schirm) der ganzen Welt kommen, [so] *wird er* ihnen das Amṛta-Heilmittel *zuteil werden lassen(?)* (bzw. *zu trinken geben(?)*), [und] sie werden aus dem Saṃsāra-Gefängnis herausgehen". Finally, there is THT 1540 f + g a 4, for which see above.

As for the syntax, in all four passages we seem to be dealing with threefold valency; a double obliquus construction is directly attested in S 8 b 2f. and in A 217 a 4f., and can be confidently restored in the other relevant passages of TB. In order to explain this kind of construction, Schmidt, 2007, 333 states that "Kausativkonstruktion vorliegt, bei der die alte Konstruktion mit doppeltem Obliquus durchaus noch gebräuchlich ist", i.e., he wants *auk-/ᴬok-* which he takes to mean 'let drink', to be a Kausativum IV (more precisely, an *o*-grade causative **doṷk-* from PIE **√deṷk* 'ziehen' as per ²LIV, 124), the zero grade **duk-* of which is said by Schmidt to be continued in *tsuk⁽ᵃ⁾-/ᴬtsukᵃ-* 'suck (out); drink', on which see s.v.; similarly, Adams, 2003, esp. 8, derives *auk-/ᴬok-* from a causative "**h₄ogʷʰeyei* 'lets drink'", which eventually "became **h₄ogʷʰei*, then **h₄ogʷʰti*"). Unfortunately, no other Kaus. IV of this morphological structure is known from Tocharian, and it is extremely unlikely from a PIE point of view that such a class of Kaus. IV could ever have existed. As has been shown in great detail and very convincingly by Hackstein, 1995, 344ff., only one explanation of the double obliquus remains, i.e., to take *auk-/ᴬok-* to be a transitive "Bewegungsverbum" (verb of motion) such as 'to move, to shift, to pass (something to/on to someone)', the second obliquus, i.e., the one that denotes a person, being one of goal or direction. With regard to semantics and etymology, Hackstein, 1995, 345ff. himself thinks that the Toch. root means 'fließen lassen' ('let flow'), and therefore is to be connected with the PIE root "**ṷegʷ-*" that according to him denoted

'feucht, netzen' (²LIV, 662f.: 'feucht machen'). As discussed above, a more general meaning 'to pass something on to someone' may suit especially the single TA attestation of the root better; therefore, I would prefer to derive *auk-/ ^Aok-* from the PIE root *√u̯eGʰ 'to shake, set in motion'; for this see Melchert, 1978, 109, with ref. (the evidence and literature he quotes in favor of setting up a PIE root with such semantics and to be kept distinct from PIE *√u̯eĝʰ 'convey, drive' [²LIV, 661f.; according to ²LIV, the meaning of this root was 'schweben; fahren'] remained unnoticed in ²LIV), especially because the zero grade *uGʰ- of this root evidently underlies another root of Tocharian, viz. *^ABwāsk^(ä)-* 'stir, move, quake, shake' (as per Melchert, 1978, 108f., followed by Adams, DoT, 589f.); for the zero grade required for this verb, see also Hackstein, 1995, 199f. Of course, it is tempting to set up just one single PIE root *√u̯eĝʰ with the original meaning 'move (tr/itr)'; cf. Hackstein, 1995, 199, who follows Rix in positing "uridg. *u̯eĝʰ- tr. 'hinbewegen'". The *o*-grade *ou̯Gʰ- may be taken for a pre-PT innovation ultimately based on the zero grade *uGʰ- as mentioned above (cf. Peyrot, 2008, 45), and, to be more precise, may have been created on the model of *dou̯k-/*duk-, vel sim.

auks- '(heran)wachsen, gedeihen', 'grow, increase' (itr) (a/?/-)
      Prs XI (a) -,-, *auksäṣṣäṃ* (MQ); — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub/Opt IV (?) -,-, *aukṣi(tär?)*; —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf *aukṣitsi*
      Pt VII(o I) in
      PPt *aukṣu*
      Ipv —

The manuals and Hackstein, 1995, 336ff. take the present stem to be of Class XI (suffix *-säsk-*), although Hackstein has shown that *-s-* after *auk-* is a root-final element (so that there is a special, completely different root *auks-*; see s.v.). However, since TA has a present stem ending in TA *-sis-* (instead of expected *-säs-*) the analysis as Prs XI is justified; see the discussion in chap. Prs XI. According to Schmidt, 1984, 152, and 1985, 431 an Inf *aukṣ[i]tsi* derived from a Sub IV has to be read in H 149.314 b 5 (pace Broomhead I, 221 and WTG, 236); see now Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 106. On the identification of the passage and its translation, see in detail Hackstein, 1995, 338 with ref.; a meaning 'to grow' on this evidence is certain for *aukṣitsi*. A subjunctive stem form of this root seems also attested in THT 1175 a 2: //// *sa warñai kektseñe aukṣi* //// "beginning with ... the body may (?) grow ...", which may also be an optative (and may further be restored to a middle form, i.e., *aukṣi(tär)*). PPt *aukṣu* presupposes a Pt VII stem for structural reasons.
= *^Aoks-* 'wachsen, heranwachsen', 'grow, increase' (itr) (a+/-/a)
      Prs XI (a+) -,-, *oksiṣ*; — Imp —
          nt-Part —

           m-Part *oksismāṃ*
           Ger I — Abstr I —
           Inf —
     Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II —
     Pt I in
     PPt *okṣu*
     Pt V (a) -,-, *okṣiññā-ci*; —
     PPt *okṣiññu*
     Ipv —
KAUSATIVUM I 'wachsen lassen', 'make grow' (tr) (x/-/-)
     Prs XI (x) -,-, *oksiṣ*; — Imp -,-, *oksiṣāt*; —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
           Inf —
     Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II —
     Pt —
     PPt —
     Ipv —

Prs TA *oksiṣ* in A 250 b 4 is transitive, to judge from the Skt. equivalent *vivardhayati* 'lets increase' in VAV 2.73 a; see Schmidt, 1987, 159f. The Imp TA *oksiṣāt* in YQ 26 b 6 is also transitive: *päśśaṣiṃ malkeyo pyāṣṭṣāt oksiṣāt* "with the milk of her breast she has nursed you and brought you up" (cf. Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 172f.).

SEM. The TA present stem of Class XI shows valency change without voice alternation, while the only active TB attestation of Prs Class XI is intransitive. ETYM. On keeping apart the roots *auks-* and *auk-*, see Schmidt, 1985, 431f. and Hackstein, 1995, 336ff., who derives *auks-/ᴬoks-* from PIE *√h₂eu̯g 'be big'. A bit differently, Kümmel (apud ²LIV, 288f.) sets up a PIE root variant *√h₂u̯eks '(heran)wachsen, groß werden' beside *√h₂eu̯g 'stark werden'. TA Sub XII *okṣiññä/a-* presupposed by Pt V substitutes a former Sub II *okṣä/sa-* coined on the model of TA *ākṣiññä/a-*, according to Hilmarsson, 1991a, 102. As a matter of fact, both the PPt *aukṣu* and TA *okṣu* 'old' can owe their -ṣ- to a formerly existing Sub II (cf. Winter, 1977, 151 = 2005, 188); but as for *aukṣu*, the fact that Tocharian B had a Sub IV from *auks-* makes it likely that this PPt belonged to a Pt VII at least synchronically.

au-n- act. 'treffen, verwunden', 'hit, wound', mid. 'beginnen', 'begin'
     (tr) (x/x/x)
     Prs Xa (x) -,-, *aunaṣṣäṃ*; — | -,-, *aunastär*;-,-, *aunaskentär* Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I *aunaṣle* Abstr I —
     Sub I (x) -,-, *auṃ*; — | -,-, *auntär*;-,-, *aunantär* Opt —

Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
Inf —
Pt III (x) -, *aunasta, auntsa;-,-, aunar| -,-, auntsate/omtsate/autsate*;
-,-, *auntsante*
PPt *aunu*
Ipv III (x) *pauṃ;- |-; pauntsat*

Hilmarsson, 1991, 81f. speculates whether 3.pl. Sub *aunantär* in 27 a 7 is simply due to a misspelling for **aunäntär.* However, the same form is now attested in the small fragment THT 1175 a 3 that does not look like an MQ text; the MQ attestation 118 b 2 of course also speaks in favor of a normally accented form *aunä́ntär.* The 3.sg. Pt *auntsa* is attested in THT 1160 a 5 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). *pauṃ* to be read in H add.149 87 (= IOL Toch 212) a 8 is most likely a 2.sg. Ipv of this root (M. Peyrot, p.c.). Maybe *aulñe* in 177 a 6 belongs here as well and not to the root *aul-* 'hineinwerfen, vorwerfen' (as was assumed by WTG, 227 and TochSprR(B), s.v., fn. 8). The *n*-less Pt III *autsate* attested in FK 590 (= PK NS 40) a 3 (see the reproduction of the facsimile apud Van Windekens, 1940, fig. III, and Couvreur, 1948, 328) beside regular *auntsate* in the same text, is certainly simply misspelled.

KAUSATIVUM IV 'zu beginnen veranlassen', 'cause to begin' (tr) (—)
Prs — Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv IV (m) *ponäṣṣar;-*

= ^{A}*o(-n)-* act. 'treffen, verwunden', 'hit, wound', mid. 'beginnen', 'begin' (tr) (m/m/x)
Prs X (m) —;-,-, *oṃsantär* Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Inf —
Sub VII (m) -,-, *oñtar* (sic);— Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt III (x) *āwu,-, os;— | -,-, osāt;-,-, osānt*
PPt *onu*
Ipv III (m) -; *posāc*

TA *oñtar* in 231 a 5 is 3.sg. The preterit and the imperative are formed from an *n*-less stem TA *āw-/o-*, whereas the present and subjunctive are formed from a nasal stem. As for the PPt, there is only TA *onu*, because the alleged variant TA *[ā]wu* in A 79 b 4 is a 1.sg. Pt; see Peyrot, 2007a, 800 and Carling, DThTA, s.v. *o-n-*, and also the translation by Thomas, 1957, 281.

Sᴇᴍ. Based on etymological considerations, Schmidt, 1974, 368ff. claims the basic meaning had been 'fassend erreichen', from which both active '(ein Ziel) erreichen, treffen' and middle 'etwas für sich, für seine Zwecke ergreifen, um damit etwa (sic) zu tun' → 'beginnen' could be derived. All finite middle forms are construed with an infinitive and denote 'begin to'; as for the PPt, it has the meaning 'begun' when construed with an infinitive, and 'hit' when constructed without infinitive. The only exception is the middle imperative that also has the meaning 'begin!' without being found together with an infinitive. Eᴛʏᴍ. The basic form of the root does not have a nasal extension; see Schmidt, 1974, 370, fn. 2, who compares Skt. *apnóti* 'achieves' (but see Kümmel, ²LIV, 237, fn. 4 with ref. for the claim that the Ved. *nu*-present is rather secondary), i.e., PIE *√h₁ep (²LIV, 237): "Auf labialen Wurzelauslaut weisen noch *omtsate* 109 b 1 and *omttsate* 375 b 1 (statt jüngerem *auntsate*)"; but see the objection by Stumpf, 1990, 71, fn. 19. See also the general discussion in chap. Sub VII 22.2.2., where it is argued that PT *āwnä- originated in a pre-PT present stem in *-nu-, cf. also Adams, DoT, 132. To be sure, the root involved will rather have been PIE *√h₂ep 'join, attach' (cf. Puhvel, 1991, 114) because of the *ā*-vowel met in TA *āwu*; at least for the semantics one is also reminded of Gk. ἅπτω 'fasten; kindle', ἅπτομαι 'grasp, begin', so *√h₂ebʰ 'touch' (Puhvel, 1991, 119 and 122) may be another possibility.

aul- '± hinwerfen', '± throw' (?) (—)
       Prs — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub I — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II *aulñe* Priv —
           Inf —
       Pt III in
       PPt *auloṣ*
       Ipv —
It is possible that the Abstr *aulñe* rather belongs to *au-n-* 'hit'; see s.v.

ausw̃ᵃ- '± klagen', '± cry, lament' (itr) (-/a/-)
       Prs — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub V (a) -,-, *auswan*; — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

Hapax in H 149.15 b 3: *kārene klāyä* (sic) *kwri auswa[n]n [o]t s[a] 4. empakwaccai mā pkwa[l]y(e)* "If she should fall into a ditch, then she will cry out: one should never put one's trust in an unreliable one", as translated by Broomhead I, 184, but, strangely enough, in contrast to his edition his translation seems to be based on the one by Krause (WTG, 71, § 75, fn. 2), who has the word separation *ot sa*, while Broomhead transliterates *n[o] ts[a]*. Krause's interpretation is much more likely. The meaning 'cry out' is not totally certain, but does fit this context. ETYM. A denominative from a noun in pre-PT *-s-u̯o-, which may have started out as a derivative from an *s*-stem based on the root *√h₂eu̯(H) 'cry out' discussed in Peters, 1980, 20.

K

ᴬkatw- 'lächerlich machen', 'ridicule' (tr) (m/-/-)

    Prs VIII (m) -,-, *katuṣtär*; — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt III in
    PPt *kakätwu*
    Ipv —

The manuals take TA //// *ktuseñc-äṃ* • in A 28 a 5 to be a further possible attestation of this root, but since there is no further context, the correct word division is uncertain, so that the form may as well be analyzed as TA *tuseñc-äṃ* from *ᴬtw⁽ä⁾-/ᴬtwās⁽ä⁾-* 'burn, enkindle' (thus TG, 428; at least it is very likely that we are dealing with a 3.pl. Prs). I rather follow the latter analysis, because the root vocalism would not match that of the undoubted Prs VIII TA *katuṣtär*. Hilmarsson, 1996, 114 makes the claim (quite unclear to me) that "A *katuṣtär* must have an erroneous -*a*- for -*ä*- > zero", evidently based on the further assumption that the noun TA *kätwes* and TB *kätt-* were cognates of this TA root. TA *kätwes*, however, is a hapax of unclear meaning, and TB *kätt-* may not belong here. SEM. Judged by the Sanskrit parallel of the PPt in A 7 b 1, the meaning is rather 'ridicule, cause someone to be ashamed' than the traditionally assumed 'deceive', according to Carling, DThTA, s.v. *kätw-*. ETYM. According to Hilmarsson, 1996, 113 and 114 the stem is a kausativum of the root attested in TB *kätt-* 'put' and we have to do with "a semantic development parallel to that of Engl. *put on* 'deceive', *set up* 'id.'".

ᴬkary- 'laugh' → *kery-* 'id.'

kalāk^ä- 'follow' → *kālāk^ä-* 'id.'

kāk^ᵃ- 'rufen, einladen', 'call, invite' (tr) (-/m/x)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V (m) *kakāmar* (sic),-, *kākatär* (S); — Opt *kākoymar*,-,-; —
        Ger II — Abstr II *kākalñe* (M, MQ) Priv *akākatte* (S)
        Inf *kākatsi* (MQ, Š)
    Pt I (x) -,-, *kāka*; — | -, *kakātai*, *kakāte*; —
    PPt *kakākau* | *kakākaṣ*
    Ipv I (a) *pokkāka/pkāka*; *pokkākas*

The 1.sg. Sub *kakāmar* is attested in PK AS 17C b 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; provenance unclear, not an MQ text). A 3.sg. Opt *kākoytär* is only listed in TEB I, 227, § 412,1 (without ref.). The 2.sg.mid. Pt is attested several times in the inscription Qu 34 (see Pinault, 1994a, 175; 2000a, 157f.). *kw^ᵃ-* 'call' and *kauk-* 'call' provide the suppletive present stems (see Couvreur, 1954, 82; Schmidt, 1974, 378f., fn. 3; and s.v. *kauk-*). In 91 b 1 one should rather read a 2.pl. *pokkākas* instead of a 2.sg. Ipv form (see ²TochSprR(B), 245). The variant Ipv form *pkāka* 'call!' is attested with certainty in PK NS 31 b 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the same text has also another remarkable Ipv form (i.e., *pälyaka-me*; see s.v. *läk^⁽ᵃ⁾-* see').

= *ᴬkāk^ᵃ-* 'rufen, einladen', 'call, invite' (tr) (-/-/x)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub V — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *kāklune*
    Pt I (x) -,-, *kāk*; — | —;-,-, *kākant*
    PPt *kākku*
    Ipv I (x) -; *p ꞈᵤkāks-äṃ* | -; *(p ꞈkkā)kāc*

TA *ken-* 'call' provides the suppletive present stem. The 2.pl.mid. Ipv form TA *(p ꞈᵤkkā)kāc* is restored by Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 192 in YQ 19 a 7. Eᴛʏᴍ. There seems to be general agreement that the Ipv forms with *po-*, TA *p ꞈᵤ-* attest to a former root-initial *kw-/kʷ-*; if this reasoning is correct, *ĝʰuh₂ᵦ-k-* (as per Hackstein, 1995, 24) or *guh₂-k-* (as per Hackstein, 2002a, 192f.) would be the obvious choices, but I fail to see how pre-TB *pækw/kʷ-* or *päkw/kʷ-* could have turned into standard-TB *pok-* by sound law. On the other hand, Hackstein, 2002a, 192 himself admits that with respect to the TB variant of the root one should have expected an "Erhalt von *kw-*", and therefore is forced into setting up a "Distanz-Assimilation *kw...k → k...k*". As for TB *po-* instead of expected †*pau-* or †*pu-*, if one does not want to assume influence from a completely lost PT *pæ-kuwā-*, one could and indeed should invoke

analogical influence from *poñ* from *we-ñ-* 'say, speak'; but if such a strategy is unavoidable with respect to *po-* of Tocharian B, one may feel free to assume that not only the TB Ipv starting with *po-* but also the TA Ipv entirely owed their anlaut to analogical influence from the Ipv forms made from [AB]*we-ñ-*, with the further implications that *pkāka* may simply be an archaism, and the root itself possibly of onomatopoeic origin.

kāñm?- '± sich vergnügen', '± be merry' (itr) (a+/-/-)
        Prs I/II (a+) -,-, *kañmāṃ* (sic);-,-, *kāñmeṃ* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *kañmāmāne* (sic, MQ)
            Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub I/II/V — Opt —
            Ger II in *kǎñmalona* Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf *kǎñmatsi*
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
The respective first vowel in the two attested forms from the subjunctive stem, *[k](a)ñmatsi* and *[k](a)ñ[m]alonasa* in 370 b 6 and b 2 (M) is unclear, so the analysis of the subjunctive stem is uncertain. Hilmarsson, 1996, 80ff. opts for Sub I, Adams, DoT, 150 rather for Sub V, but the affiliation of a Sub V with a Prs I would be unusual. To be sure, the present stem formation is not altogether certain either. Although 3.pl. *kāñmeṃ* shows a thematic ending, the stem could originally have been an athematic one (Class I), because an analogical thematic ending of the 3.pl. is common in Prs I paradigms. The *m*-Part *kañmāmāne* attested in 118 a 7 does not secure a Prs I either; rendering of accented /á/ by ⟨ā⟩ is rare in MQ texts (cf. Peyrot, 2008, 34ff.), and so we are rather dealing with a writing error a for thematic-looking form **kañmemāne* (probably due to the following akṣara *mā*). SEM. The verb is traditionally translated with 'play'. Differently, Hilmarsson, 1996, 80ff., who posits the meaning 'sing' based on etymological considerations. The verb's semantics cannot be determined with certainty on the basis of the forms attested so far, but something like '± be merry' is the most likely guess. ETYM. According to Hilmarsson, 1996, 80ff., this is a denominative formation based on a *men*-stem pre-PT **kan-men-* (hence the *-ñ-*) 'song' (= Lat. *carmen*), which he says is also somehow reflected in "*kāñmo*" 'song', but he is not explicit about the strange kind of derivational morphology implied (note, however, that Greek seems to know denominatives of a θέρμω type).

kātk- 'sich freuen', 'rejoice, be glad' (itr) (a+/-/a)
        Prs II (a+) *kātkau*,-, *kāccäṃ*;-,-, *kātkeṃ* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *katkemane*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub II — Opt —

           Ger II *kaccalya* (MQ) Abstr II — Priv —

           Inf —

      Pt I (a) —;-,-, *kaccāre*

      PPt *kakāccu/kakkāccu| kakāccoṣ/kakkācoṣ*

      Ipv —

The PPt *kak(k)āccoṣ* is attested several times, e.g., in PK AS 17A b2 (see Pinault, 1984b, 169) and in THT 2323 a 2.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'erfreuen', 'make glad' (tr) (m+/-/-)

      Prs IXb (m+) -,-, *kātkästär;* — Imp —

           nt-Part *kātkäṣṣeñca*

           m-Part *kātkäskemane*

           Ger I — Abstr I —

      Sub IXb — Opt —

           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

           Inf *kātkässi*

      Pt IV in

      PPt *kakātkäṣṣu*

      Ipv IV (m) -; *pkātkäṣṣat*

The 2.pl. Ipv *pkātkäṣṣat* is attested in PK AS 17D b 2 (see Couvreur, 1954, 90; Schmidt, 1974, 506), the 3.sg. Prs *kātkastra* also in THT 1319 b 5 and THT 3603 frg. c a 2.

= ᴬ*kātk-* 'sich freuen', 'rejoice, be glad' (itr) (a+/-/-)

      Prs II (a+) -,-, *kāckäṣ;-, kāckäc,-* Imp —

           nt-Part —

           m-Part *kātkmāṃ*

           Ger I *kāckäl* Abstr I —

           Inf —

      Sub — Opt —

           Ger II — Abstr II —

      Pt —

      PPt —

      Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs TA *kātkeñc* in A 230 a 3 does not belong to this root (pace Sieg, 1937, 134, fn. 6), but rather to ᴬ*kātk^ᵃ-* 'arise' (thus the old analysis by TG, 426). The Ger I TA *kāckäl* is attested in YQ 29 a 5. TG, 426 lists the forms with palatalized stem final under a different root *kāck-* (together with the noun TA *kācke* 'desire, longing'), but all these stems certainly belong together, *-ck-* simply being the regular TA outcome of palatalized root-final *-tk-*; see chap. Sound Laws 1.7.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'erfreuen', 'make glad' (tr) (m+/-/-)

      Prs VIII (m+) -,-, *kātkäṣtär;* — Imp -,-, *kātkṣāt;* —

           nt-Part *kātkṣant*

           m-Part *kātkäsmāṃ*

           Ger I — Abstr I —

           Inf *kātkässi*

Sub — Opt —
  Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt IV in
PPt in *kākätkṣuräṣ*
Ipv —

ETYM. PIE *ĝ/gh₂dʰ-sk̂e/o- from PIE *√ĝ/geh₂dʰ 'in Freude geraten' (²LIV, 184); differently, Hackstein, 2002, 8 derives the root from a PIE syntagma *geh₂ dʰh₁sk̂e/o- 'in Glanz = Freude (ver)setzen'.

ᴬ*kātk^ä-* 'aufstehen, entstehen', '(a)rise' (itr) (x/a/a)
  Prs VII (x) -,-, *kātäṅkāṣ;-,-, kātäṅkeñc* | — ;-,-, *kātäṅkāntär*
    Imp -,-, *kātäñśā;* —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I *kātäṅkāl* Abstr I —
    Inf —
  Sub V (a) -,-, *kātkaṣ;-,-, kātkeñc* Opt —
    Ger II *kātkal* Abstr II *kātklune*
  Pt I (a) -, *kātkaṣt, kātäk;-,-, kātkar*
  PPt *kākätku*
  Ipv —

A 3.pl.mid. TA *(kātä)ṅkāntä* is restored by Geng/Laut/Pinault, 2004a, 45ff. in A 259 a [recte b] 3: TA *(kātä)ṅkāntä ñäkcyāñ w(akañ)* "es erheben sich göttliche Stimmen". Even though this is a philologically cogent guess, it would make the form the only middle of this paradigm, and basically intransitive verbs like this one rarely show voice alternation (see chap. Valency 4.7.1.). ETYM. See Hilmarsson, 1996, 110 with ref. for connecting the root with Gk. χάζομαι 'withdraw'.

kānt^ä- 'abreiben', 'rub (off)' (tr) (m/m/-)
  Prs VI (m) — Imp -,-, *kantanoytär;* —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub V (m) — Opt -,-, *kāntoytär;* —
    Ger II — Abstr II *kāntalñe* Priv —
    Inf *kāntatsi*
  Pt —
  PPt —
  Ipv —

The subjunctive has persistent root-initial accent.

SEM. *kāntoytär* in 19 b 6 and *kantanoy(t)ä(r)* in 429 a 3 are either deponential or reflexive middles ('rub oneself', cf. Schmidt, 1974, 325f.); the attestation in H 149.26/30 b 4 is a passive (cf. Schmidt, 1974, 207). ETYM. According to Hilmarsson, 1996, 77, to be derived from PIE *√gnet (²LIV, 191 'drücken, kneten', without the Toch. verb).

kānts^a- 'schärfen, wetzen', 'sharpen, whet' (tr) (-/-/a)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *kāntsasi*
        Pt I (a) —;-,-, *kāṃtsāre* (MQ)
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The subjunctive stem has persistent root-initial accent. Etym. See Adams, DoT, 151 for various possible connections.

kāp^a- 'desire' → *kāw^a-* 'id.'

^Akāp^a- 'well up; be greedy' → *kāw^a-* 'desire'

kām^a- 'bringen, holen, nehmen', 'carry, take' (tr) (-/-/m)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I (m) *kāmmai,-, kamāte; kamāmnte* (sic),-, *kamānte*
        PPt *kakāmau| kakāmaṣ*
        Ipv —

The 1.sg. *kāmmai* is also attested in PK AS 17C b 5, a variant *kāmai* in PK Cp 37, 20; the 1.pl. *kamāmnte* is found in PK Cp 7, 2, PK Cp 37, 10 and 18 (all unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; on the reading *-mnte* instead of traditional *-mtte*, see Peyrot, 2008, 156). The stem provides the suppletive preterit stem of *pär-* 'carry'; see Schmidt, 1974, 360ff.; 1984, 152. A-character is certain.

= ***^Akām^a-*** 'bringen, holen, nehmen', 'carry, take' (tr) (-/m/m)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub V (m) —;-,-, *kāmantär* Opt -,-, *kāmitär;—*
                Ger II *kāmal* Abstr II *kāmlune*
        Pt I (m) -,-, *kāmat;-,-, kāmant*
        PPt in *kākmurāṣ*
        Ipv I (m) *pkāmār; pkāmāc*

The Ger II TA *kāmal* is listed in TEB II, 264 (correcting TA *kamäl* as given in TEB I, 196, § 348,2). *ᴬpär-* 'carry, bring' provides the suppletive present stem.
Sᴇᴍ. According to Schmidt, 1974, 367, this root had non-durative semantics (in contrast to *pär-/ᴬpär-*). Eᴛʏᴍ. Ringe, 1996, 35 derives the root from PIE *√k̂emh₂; differently Adams, DoT, 371 and ²LIV, 186, PIE *√gem 'drücken, zusammenpressen; fassen'. At any rate, we seem to have to do with a denominative.

kāy³- '(Mund) öffnen, aufsperren', 'open (the mouth)' (tr) (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I in
        PPt *kakāyau| kakāyaṣ*
        Ipv —

The obl. PPt *kakāyaṣ* is attested in G-Su 1 a 2 (see Pinault, 1987, 134). A-character is reconstructed with some certainty. *koyn kāy³-* is diachronically a figura etymologica; cf. chap. Valency, 4.10.3.

kār³- 'sammeln', 'gather' (tr) (-/a/x)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V (a) *kārau,-,-;—* Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *kāratsi*
        Pt I (x) —;-,-, *karāre| —*; *karǎmte* (MQ),-, *karānte*
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The subjunctive shows persistent initial accent. The reading of the suffix vowel of the MQ form *kar[ǎ]mte* in 576 b 5 is uncertain. Eᴛʏᴍ. PIE *√h₂ger or *√h₂ĝer 'sammeln' (²LIV, 276, without the Toch. verb); Adams, DoT, 153.

kārp⁽ᵃ⁾- 'herabsteigen', 'descend' (itr) (m/a/a)

        Prs IV (m) *korpomar,-, korpotär;-,-, korpontär* Imp —;-,-, *korpyentär*
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V (a) -, *kārpat, kārpaṃ;-,-, kārpaṃ* Opt —
                Ger II *kārpalle* Abstr II *kārpalñentse* Priv *ākkārpacce* (MQ)
                Inf *kārpassi/kārpatsi*

       Pt I (a) *karpāwa*, *karpāsta*, *kārpa*; *karpām*,-,-
       PPt *kakārpau/ kakkārpau | kakārpaṣ*
       Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs *korpontär* is attested in PK AS 17K b 2, and the Priv in PK AS 12I a 6 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). Krause, 1950, 31 cites a 1.sg. Imp *korpimar* (without ref., not in WTG). *karpām* in PK AS 12K b 3 is a preterit, according to Couvreur, 1954, 86 (contra WTG, 228), and not a subjunctive form (for a translation of the whole text, see Couvreur, 1953, 282f.). According to Thomas, 1954, 715, a 3.pl. Pt *k(arpāre)* can be restored in 115 b 3, but that restoration is not mentioned again in his re-edition of the text in ²TochSprR(B). The Ger *kārpalle* is attested in PK AS 17H a 2-3, the Abstr *kārpalñentse* in PK AS 17H b 1, and the regular Inf form *kārpatsi* in PK AS 17G b 6 (all unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The subjunctive shows persistent root-initial accent.

KAUSATIVUM I 'herabsteigen lassen; weiterreichen', 'make descend; pass on'
       (tr) (m/a/x)
       Prs IXb (m) -,-, *kārpastär* (MQ); — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub IXb (a) -,-, *kārpäṣṣäṃ*; — Opt *kārpäṣṣim*,-,-; —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf —
       Pt IV (x) -, *karpäṣṣasta* (MQ),-; — | -,-, *kārpäṣṣate* (MQ); —
       PPt in *kakkārpäṣṣormeṃ*
       Ipv —

The 3.sg. Sub *kārpäṣṣäṃ* is attested in PK NS 95 b 2 ("Kaufpreis herabsetzen"); see Pinault, 2000, 82. Instead of *karpäṣṣate* (thus WTG), one has to read *kārpäṣṣate* in the unpublished passage PK AS 12K a 4 (MQ), according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.

= ᴬ*kārp⁽ä⁾-* 'herabsteigen', 'descend' (itr) (a+/-/a)
       Prs VI (a+) -,-, *kārnaṣ*;-,-, *kārneñc* Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part *kārnmāṃ*
           Ger I *kārnal* Abstr I —
           Inf *kārnatsi*
       Sub V — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II *kārplune*
       Pt I (a) -, *kārpaṣt*, *kārp*; —
       PPt *kākärpu*
       Ipv —

The Ger I TA *kārnal* is attested in THT 1377 frg. a b 2 (M. Peyrot, p.c.). The PPt TA *kākrärpu* (sic) (construed with to TA *sutraṃ*) renders Skt. *sūtraparyāpanna-* in A 353 a 4 (see Couvreur, 1956, 69 and Schmidt, 1989, 13 and 32). Whereas Couvreur sets up a separate root ᴬ*krārp-* for the form

(following TG, 435) and translates "auf das Sūtra bezogen", Schmidt argues that we are rather dealing with a PPt and translates "in das Sūtra aufgenommen", so that a root TA *krārp-* separate from *ᴬkārp⁽ᵃ⁾-* would be obsolete (pace Schmidt, 1989, 32, fn. 2, Pinault, 1989, 121 interprets TA *kākrärpu* as a mere misspelling rather than a "Mischbildung").

KAUSATIVUM I 'herabsteigen lassen', 'make descend' (tr) (−)

       Prs — Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —
             Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt IV in
       PPt *kākärpṣu*
       Ipv —

SEM. The grundverb is basically intransitive, but as a verb of motion it can be constructed with an obliquus of direction. ETYM. Hilmarsson, 1993, 178, based on Van Windekens, 1941, derives the verb from PIE *√ku̯erp 'turn'; ²LIV, 392f. sets up the root in question as *√kʷerpH 'sich wenden', the A-character of the Toch. root apparently being the only reason for setting up the root-final *-H. Differently, Adams, DoT, 154 (*korb).

kālāk̑ᵃ- 'folgen', 'follow' (tr) (m/-/a)

       Prs I (m) -,-, *koloktär;*-,-, *kolokantär* (MQ) Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part *kolokmane*
             Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
             Inf —
       Pt I (a) -,-, *śalāka;* —
       PPt *kakālakaṣ*
       Ipv —

The 3.pl. *kolo[ka]nträ* in 255 a 2 may be restored to *kolo[k](e)nträ*; see chap. Prs III/IV 26.3. I fail to see why *śalāk<a>=ike* in 408 b 3 should be "höchst ungewiß" (thus WTG, 169, § 169). The form shows the expected sandhi treatment (on which see Stumpf, 1971a, 103), a translation 'followed' does make sense here, and the form of the preterit is morphologically not so problematic (at least apart from the fact that a former Prs IV is usually not associated with a Pt I with root-initial palatalization; see chap. Prs III/IV). The A-character is only reconstructed, but certain. We are dealing with a present of Class IV having undergone *o*-drop; see chap. Prs III/IV 26.3. The verb is, nevertheless, transitive; see Schmidt, 1974, 290.

~ ᴬ*kälk*ᵃ- 'gehen', 'go' (itr) (-/a/a)

Prs — Imp —
   nt-Part —
   m-Part —
   Ger I — Abstr I —
   Inf —
Sub V (a) *kalkam, kalkat, kalkaṣ; kälkāmäs, kälkāc, kälkeñc*
   Opt *kälkim, kälkit, kälkiṣ;—*
   Ger II *kälkāl* Abstr II *kälkālune*
Pt I (a) -, *kälkāṣt, kälkā-m̥;-,-, kalkar*
PPt *kälko*
Ipv —

The 2.sg. Sub TA *ka(lkat)* can be restored with certainty in A 70 a 2; see Sieg, Übers. II, 43, fn. 5. TA *kälk-* provides the suppletive stem to ᴬ*i-* 'go' (itself restricted to present and imperative). The verb is intransitive, but being a verb of motion, it can be constructed with an obliquus of direction; see Thomas, 1983, 12ff.

Etym. A connection of *kālāk*ᵃ- and ᴬ*kälka-* was first proposed by Cowgill apud Ringe, 1987, 105 and Adams, 1988, 401, the latter deriving both roots from a seṭ variant of *√kʷel, which is, however, rather a seṭ root in the first place, viz. *√kʷelh₁ 'eine Drehung machen, etc.' (²LIV, 386ff.).

*kāw*ᵃ- 'wollen, begehren', 'desire, crave' (tr) (m/-/m)

Prs XII (m) —;-,-, *kawāññentär* Imp —
   nt-Part —
   m-Part —
   Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub V — Opt —
   Ger II — Abstr II *kāwalyñe* Priv —
   Inf *kāwatsi*
Pt I (m) -,-, *kawāte-ne;—*
PPt *kakāpau | kakāpoṣ* (sic; ?)
Ipv —

According to TochSprR(B), *(ka)waññiträ* is a possible restoration in the fragment 147 frg. 2 a 2. The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. The PPt *kakāpau* in 66 a 8 is without context, but would fit the morphological pattern (cf. WTG, 227). Against the claim made by Adams, DoT, 152 that the PPt *kakāpau* preserved *p* in order to avoid homophony with the PPt of *kau-* 'kill' see Winter, 2003, 131, ad p. 152, who correctly pointed out that the regular PPt of *kau-* 'kill' is *kakāwu*, ending in -*u* and not in -*au*. *kakāpoṣ* in 179 b 3 (without much context) said by Saito, 2006, 301 to belong here would have to be a synchronically irregular form.

= ᴬ*kāp*ᵃ- 'aufwallen', 'gierig sein', 'well up', 'be greedy' (itr) (-/a/a)

Prs — Imp —
   nt-Part —
   m-Part —

     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub V (a) -,-, *kāpaṣ;*— Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II *kāplune*
  Pt I (a) —;-,-, *kāpar*
  PPt —
  Ipv —

SEM. An apparently intransitive TA *kāpaṣ-äṃ* 'well up' with reference to 'blood' is now attested in YQ 15 b 1: TA *omäl ysār ṣuṅkac kāpaṣäṃ* "hot blood will rise to his throat"; see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 50f.; cf. the Old Turkish parallel version in MaitrHami I 13 b 8ff. "und er wird warmes Blut ausspucken" (Geng/Klimkeit, 1988, 99). The second finite TA attestation is likewise constructed without a direct object: A 340 a 3 *śwātsiṣy ākālyo kāpar ymār* "In dem Wunsche nach Essen wurden sie [scil. die Pretas] schnell begierig"; see Schmidt, 1974, 146, fn. 1. The TB verb, on the other hand, is transitive. ETYM. It is a matter of debate whether the Prs XII is deverbative or denominative (see, e.g., the discussion by Hilmarsson, 1991a, 80f.), but since the Prs XII *kāwāññ-* retains A-character, I assume it was taken for a denominative even synchronically; see chap. Prs/Sub XII 35.1.3.1. I think it is best to assume that the meaning 'well up' in YQ 15 b 1 was the more original one, and that the root of the Toch. verb is hence to be derived from PIE *√k(u̯)ap 'well up', as suggested by Pinault, 1992, 167f.; differently, Hilmarsson, 1996, 123. Note that ²LIV prefers not to reconstruct a root *√k(u̯)ap of that meaning, but sets up various different roots such as *√keu̯p, *√k̑u̯eh₁p, and *√ku̯ep instead, so that one would have to derive the root vowel from PIE *-ŏ- or *-ŏh₁-. Note further that the root variant *kāwā-* instead of older *kāpā-* in Tocharian B is attested in all forms from all TB varieties except in the PPt (strictly speaking, we do not know for certain that *kakāpau* belongs here, because it is without context), which is somewhat surprising, because Winter, 1955, 224 = 1984, 108 = 2005, 9 has shown that *p > w* is rather an eastern/informal feature (but not exclusively; see Stumpf, 1990, 73). It is a likely guess that the whole paradigm started out as a denominative to the *eh₂*-stem noun that probably underlies *kāwo*, obl. *kāwa*; if this is correct, *kakāpoṣ* may indeed belong here with *-oṣ* developed out from PT *-åwæs'ä with PT *-å̊- to be expected in a derivative from an *eh₂*-stem.

^A*kāṣ-ⁱññ-* 'anschreien, schelten', 'shout at, reprimand, chastise' (tr) (m/m/-)
   Prs XII (m) — Imp -,-, *kāṣiññāt;*—
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf *kāṣiñtsi*
   Sub XII (m) — Opt -,-, *kāṣiññitär;*—
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt V in PPt *kākṣiñu*
   Ipv —

A middle instead of an active form TA *kāṣiññ[ā](t)* is restored in A 28 a 5 by Schmidt, 1974, 172, due to morphological considerations. ETYM. Maybe derived from PIE *√k̑eHs 'anweisen' (²LIV, 318f.), see Hilmarsson, 1996, 102 with ref.; differently, Hackstein, 2003b, 84. Apparently a denominative (as per Hackstein) and not a deverbative as claimed by Hilmarsson, 1991a, 96.

[ᴬ*kāṣt-* '?', Couvreur, 1959, 252 restores TA *kākäṣ(tu)* from an otherwise unattested root ᴬ*kāṣt-* 'être irrité, insulter' in A 354 b 1, but this remains uncertain, as per Schmidt, 1989, 76, fn. 15; since the form translates Skt. *hataḥ* 'killed', Carling, DThTA, s.v. *koṣtā-* also proposes a simple mistake for TA *kākoṣtu*; actually we seem to have to do with the same kind of TA *w-loss in a PPt that is also found in TA *lyalyku* and TA *papyätku*.]

kät^B- 'streuen', 'strew' (tr) (x/x/x)
        Prs VI (x) *katnau,-, katnaṃ;-,-, käṃtaṃ* (MQ)/*känta-ne* (MQ)
                Imp —;-,-, *kätnoyentär-ne*
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *kätnāmane*
                Ger I *kätnālle/käntalle* (MQ) Abstr I —
        Sub V (x) -,-, *kātaṃ;—* | —;-,-, *katantar* (sic) Opt -,-, *katoytär;—*
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *katasi*
        Pt I (x) -, *śtasta* (MQ),-; *śitām,-, śtare* (MQ) | -,-, *ktāte;-,-, ktānte*
        PPt *ktau/ktow*
        Ipv —

On the analysis of the older present stem allomorph *känta-*, see the discussion in chap. Prs VII (*käntalle* is attested in THT 1535 frg. a a 5; *käntale* in THT 1535 frg. a b 2 and frg. b b 6; see Peyrot, 2008, 152). A 3.pl. Imp *kätnoyentär-nesa* is to be read in 620 b 3, according to Schmidt, 2000, 228f. (or rather to be emended to *kätnoyen<tär->nesa*). The m-Part *kätnāmane* that is attested in an unpublished Berlin fragment, according to Thomas, 1979, 163, can be found in THT 1287 frg. a b 3; the preterit forms *ktāte* and *ktānte* are attested in PK AS 15C a 5, resp. PK NS 36A a 5 (see Couvreur, 1964, 247 with fn. 58; ²TochSprR(B), 243). The Inf *[k]atasi* listed by Schmidt, 1986a, 648 without precise ref. can be found in PK Cp 27 a 3 (unpublished, M. Peyrot, p.c.); the incorrect Inf variant *katsi* listed in TochSprR(B), glossary, 107 without ref. is rather due to a wrong reading or word separation; a Ger II *(kata)lle* is further restored by TochSprR(B) in 291 b 6. The subjunctive shows ablaut and persistent initial accent. The 1.pl. Pt *śitām* is attested in an unpublished document of profane nature with the meaning 'sowed', according to Schmidt, 2002, 8.

= ᴬ*kät^B-* 'streuen', 'strew' (tr) (x/-/a)
        Prs VI (x) -,-, *knāṣ-äm;—* | —;-,-, *knāntär* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —

> > > Ger I *knāl* Abstr I —
> > > Inf —
> > Sub — Opt —
> > > Ger II — Abstr II —
> > Pt I (a) —;-,-, *katar*
> > PPt *kto*
> > Ipv —

The Ger I TA *knāl* is attested in PK NS 2 b 3 (see Carling, DThTA, s.v.). A-character is certain.

ETYM. PIE *√(s)kedh₂ 'zersplittern, zerstreuen' (²LIV, 550f.); see most recently Blažek, 2001, 81f.

kätk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'überschreiten, vorübergehen, (Sünde) begehen, übertreten (Gesetz)',
> > 'cross, pass (time), surpass, trespass, commit (a sin)' (tr/itr) (x/x/a)
> > Prs VI (a) (tr/itr) —;-,-, *kätkanaṃ/ kätknaṃ* (MQ) Imp —
> > > nt-Part —
> > > m-Part —
> > > Ger I — Abstr I —
> > Prs VII (a) (itr) -,-, *kättaṅkäṃ;-,-, kättaṅkäṃ* Imp —
> > > nt-Part —
> > > m-Part —
> > > Ger I — Abstr I —
> > Prs IXa (m) (tr) -,-, *kätkāṣtär* (sic);— Imp —
> > > nt-Part —
> > > m-Part —
> > > Ger I — Abstr I —
> > Sub V (x) (tr/itr) -, *kātkat/katkat* (MQ), *katkaṃ* (MQ);— |
> > > -,-, *kätkātär-me* (D);— Opt -,-, *kätkoytär-me* (Š);—
> > > Ger II *katkalyi* (D) Abstr II *kätkālñe* (M)/*katkalñe* (S)
> > > Priv *ekätkātte* (MQ)
> > > Inf *katkatsi*
> > Pt I (a) (tr) *śätkāwa, śätkāsta, śatka;-,-, śitkāre*
> > PPt *kätkau/ kätkowwa* (MQ) | *kätkoṣ*
> > Ipv —

TochSprR(B), 58, fn. 3 restores a 3.pl. *(kä)t[k]naṃ* in 36 b 4 (instead of regular *katknaṃ*), because the text is an MQ text, and the same form *kätknaṃ* is now actually attested in the MQ-character text THT 1339 a 6 (Peyrot, 2008, 144). *kättaṅkäṃ* in 3 a 4 is a 3.pl. Class VII present form; see Schmidt, 1985, 428. A 3.sg. Prs IXa variant *kätkāṣtär* (sic) is attested in PK Dd 6, 2, 4 (Pinault, 1987, 184f.). The 2.sg. Sub *kātkat* is often found in KVāc (see Schmidt, 1986, passim). The Priv *e(kä)tk(ātte)* 'ohne zu überschreiten' is attested in PK AS 12C b 1 (MQ); see Couvreur, 1954, 82; Thomas, 1987a, 91; and Hilmarsson, 1991, 63f. There are different accent variants to be found in the Sub; see chap. Sub I/V 18.2.11. The expected 2.sg. Pt *śätkāsta* is attested in THT 1927 b 3. Since in MQ texts unaccented /ä/ is usually not rendered by ⟨a⟩ (cf. Peyrot, 2008, 34f.), I propose to restore the anomalous *[śa]tka[st](a)* in 247 a 1 (MQ) to

[śä]tka[st](a), *[śi]tka[st](a)*, or the Kaus. *[śā]tka[st](a)* (the manuscript is hardly legible anymore). The PPt *kätkoṣ* is found in 133 a 2.

KAUSATIVUM IV 'überschreiten lassen', 'let pass, cross' (tr) (-/-/x)

        Prs IXb — Imp —
                nt-Part *śatkäṣṣeñca*
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub II — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *śäccätsī* (MQ)
        Sub IXb — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *katkässi* (S)
        Pt II (x) -, *śātkasta* (MQ), -;— | -, *śātkatai* (MQ),-;—
        PPt —
        Ipv IV (m) *kätkäṣṣar* (sic);-

The active 2.sg. Pt *śātkasta* (wrongly written *śetkasta*) is attested in THT 3597 (= Mainz 655, 1) b 6: *śetkasta ceṃ cäk=aurce śār̨* "you (sg.) let them cross the wide river" (cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 274). On the semantics and syntactic behavior of the kausativum stems, see in detail chap. Valency 4.9.2.

= *ᴬkätk⁽ä⁾-* 'über-, durchschreiten, vorübergehen, (Sünde) begehen', 'cross, (sur)pass, pass (time), commit (a sin)' (tr/itr) (x/a/a)

        Prs VII (x) (tr) —;-,-, *ktäṅkeñc* | —;-,-, *ktäṅkāntär* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *ktäṅkātsi*
        Sub V (a) (tr/itr) -, *katkat, katkaṣ;-, kätkāc, kätkeñc* Opt —
                Ger II *kätkāl* Abstr II *kätkālune*
        Pt I (a) (tr/itr) -,-, *kcäk/śtäk;-, katkas, katkar*
        PPt *kätko*
        Ipv —

A 3.sg. Prs TA *ktäṅkāṣ* is only listed in TEB I, 205, § 370,1 without ref. and may only be reconstructed. The 3.sg. Pt TA *śtäk* is the regular continuant of *śātkā, whereas TA *kcäk* shows metathesis of palatalization; see chap. Sound Laws 1.7., and Pinault, 2006, 106f., who explains the sequence with recourse to analogy. A 2.pl. Pt *katkas* seems attested in the small fragment THT 1953 b 2 (see Carling, DThTA, s.v. *kätkā-*).

KAUSATIVUM IV '± wild werden/ausbrechen lassen', '± cause to be out of control/run wild' (tr) (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —

Ger II — Abstr II —

Pt II in

PPt *śaśätku*

Ipv —

Hapax in A 360, 8 referring to a cow running wild; on the passage see chap. Valency 4.4.1.

SEM. Probably any stem of the grundverb paradigm could be used both intransitively with the meanings 'cross' (construed with perlative) or 'pass (of time)', and transitively with the meanings 'cross something' or 'commit (a sin)'. ᴬᴮ*kätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* is also used as equivalent of Skt. *adhyā* √pad 'get into (culpable behavior)' and Skt. *ati* √kram 'cross over', 'leave unnoticed' (see Thomas, 1985, 92, fn. 11). ᴬ*kätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* can also be constructed with the preverb TA *asuk* (~ Skt. *ati*) with the meaning 'cross through' (like in A 395 b 2 "they did not cross through the woods") and 'surpass' (as in YQ 29 b 7f.). ETYM. Klingenschmitt, 1982, 188f. suggests derivation from PIE *√dʰegᵘʰh₂ 'in die Nähe kommen, fast erreichen, vorbeigehen' (thus ²LIV, 134f.), and further assumes the present stem *gᵘʰþn̥ə- > PT *ktänā- and the preterit stem *dʰegᵘʰ-ə-t > PT *t'äkā- had mutually influenced each other; he is followed by Schmidt, 1988, 475f.; 1989a, 308ff.; 1992, 103ff.; 1994a, 224ff. (Schmidt's assumption that we are dealing here with an outcome -k- of a laryngeal is phonologically implausible; see chap. *tk*-Roots, fn. 1). For objections to Klingenschmitt and Schmidt, see Pinault, 2004, 4f., who — like Hilmarsson, 1996, s.v. — basically follows Adams' etymology with Lat. *cēdō* 'go' (see now Adams, DoT, 159: *kd-sk̑e/o-); for the TA preterit, see also Pinault, 2006, 106f. Lubotsky, 2004, 323ff. sets up the PIE root as *√k̑iesdʰ (sic): Prs. *k̑izdʰ-sk̑e/o- > kästsk- > (with dissimilation) *kätsk- > *kätk-. Again differently, Hackstein, 2001, 34, and 2002, 7 proposes as etymon a PIE syntagma *k̑e dʰh₁-sk̑e/o-. TA *śätko* (A 371 a 5 *maṅkant śätko* "one who committed a sin"; see TG, 428, fn. 1; in addition, *maṅka<nt> śatko* in line a 4) is not a PPt of this root (thus Couvreur, 1956, 81; in TG, 428 the form is left unanalyzed), but is an adjective formed on the basis of the TA equivalent of *śatko* (only attested by the adverb *śatkai* 'very').

kätt- 'hinstellen, legen', 'put, set (down)' (tr) (a/m/-)

Prs II (a) — Imp —;-,-, *käccīyeṃ-ne*

nt-Part —

m-Part —

Ger I *käccillya* Abstr I —

Sub I/II (m) — Opt -,-, *käccītär;—

Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

Inf —

Pt —

PPt —

Ipv —

Strictly speaking, the subjunctive stem can be thematic or athematic, but with respect to the root structure, a thematic Sub II is, nevertheless, more plausible. SEM. We are dealing with a verb designating '± put, set', more precisely with

the notion of a downward movement, as per Adams, DoT, 159, s.v. ²*kätk-* '±
lower, set (down)' (on account of an etymological connection with the
adjective *kätkare* 'deep'). Eᴛʏᴍ. The etymology, the PT root shape, and even
the inner-Tocharian connections are controversial. Traditionally, the root
shape is set up as *kätt-* (e.g., WTG, 229). Hilmarsson, 1996, 113 and 114 has
argued that the Prs VIII and Pt III of the TA root ᴬ*kätw-* 'deceive' belong to
what I call antigrundverb paradigm made from a TA cognate of the TB root,
which would lead to setting up a PT root *kätw- (thus also Winter, 1972, 388 =
1984, 209 = 2005, 160, on the basis of a possible connection with TB *ketwe*/TA
katu 'piece of jewellery'). The semantic development would be a "parallel of
Engl. *put on* 'deceive', *set up* 'id.'" (Hilmarsson, l.c.), but note that ᴬ*katw-*
means rather 'ridicule' (see above). Adams, DoT, 159, on the other hand, sets
up *kätk-* on account of a possible connection with TB *kätkare* 'deep' (based on
Van Windekens). *kätk-* is also the structure on which Hackstein, 2002, 7 bases
his derivation from a PIE verbal compound *$\hat{k}$é d^{h}h$_1$-s$\hat{k}$e/o-. Similarly,
Klingenschmitt, 1975, 162 = 2005, 145, fn. 21, and 1982, 189, who derives the
Opt *käccitär* from *kä-täcitär said to consist of a preverb *kä < PIE *kom and
*tät- 'put'.

ᴬ**kätw-** 'deceive' → ᴬ*katw-* 'ridicule'

kän⁽ⁿ⁾- 'zustandekommen, erfüllt werden', 'come about, occur, be fulfilled'
   (itr) (m/m/-)
   Prs IXa (m) -, -, *knastär;-,-, knaskentär* Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub I (m) -,-, *kantär;*— Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
     Inf —
   Sub III (m) -,-, *knetär-me;*—
     Opt -,-, *kñitär/käñiyoytär/kñyoytar* (sic);—
     Ger II *knelle* Abstr II *knelñe* Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt III in
   PPt *kekenu| kekenoṣ*
   Ipv —
On the present stem formations, see Hackstein, 1995, 230ff. in detail. I also
follow Hackstein's analysis of *k(a)ntär-ñ(i)* in 594 a 1 as Sub I (or II): *(akāl)k
k(a)ntär-ñ* or *k(a)ntär ñi* "may my wish come true" based on the restoration by
TochSprR(B). A transitive meaning, however, "may (s)he fulfill" cannot be
excluded; see also chap. Sub III 20.1.3. Pinault, 1989a, 154 furthermore restores
[ka](ntär) in PK AS 16.2 a 1, but since we rather have a present form (and a Prs
I/II would be morphologically unusual in this kind of paradigm), Hackstein,
l.c., rather proposes a restoration to *ka(lytär).* On the Opt variants *käñiyoytär*
and *kñyoytar*, see Hackstein, 1995, 237, fn. 93; Peyrot, 2008, 149; differently,

Peters, 2006, 335, fn. 16 and chap. Sub III 20.1.2. The PPt *kekenu* has the meaning 'equipped, provided with' (= TA *kaknu*).

Kausativum I 'zustandekommen lassen, erfüllen', 'fulfill (a wish)' (tr) (a/m/a)

    Prs IXb (a) -,-, *kanaṣäṃ-nne* (sic);— Imp —
        nt-Part *kanṣeñca*
        m-Part —
        Ger I *känäṣäle* (MQ) Abstr I —
    Sub V (m) *kyānamar* (S),-,-;— Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt II (a) *kyānawa*, *kyānasta*, *kyāna*;-,-, *kānare* (sic)
    PPt —
    Ipv —

Sieg/Siegling restore a 2.pl.act. Prs/Sub IX *k[an](aścer)* in 81 b 1, which does fit the context ("if you will fulfill my wish"); since *kanaṣäṃ-nne* shows a similar stem allomorph *kánā-* and since preservation of A-character in *sk*-stems is also attested otherwise (see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.4.), one would not even have to assume a misspelling for *kan(äścer)*. However, Hackstein, 1995, 235f. points out that a transitive Sub I (or II) is also possible; in the end, the restoration remains a matter of speculation. On *kanaṣäṃ-nne* in PK NS 48 a 1, see Thomas, 1979, 179, fn. 151. In addition, a Ger <u>*kanaṣale*</u> (Prs IXb or the expected Sub IXb) seems attested in the small fragment THT 1657 a 2 (archaic) without context. On the morphologically odd *kyānamar*, see chap. Sub I/V 18.3.1.

= ^A***kän-*** 'zustandekommen', 'come about, occur' (itr) (m/m/-)

    Prs VIII (m) -,-, *knäṣtär*;-,-, *kämsantär* Imp —;-,-, *kämṣānt*
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub III (m) -,-, *knatär*;— Opt -,-, *knitär*;—
        Ger II — Abstr II *knalune*
    Pt 0/III in
    PPt *kaknu*
    Pt —
    Ipv —

The middle Imp TA *kämṣānt* in A 222 a 4 and A 239 a 1 is intransitive; see Schmidt, 1974, 135 and for the latter also Carling, DThTA, s.v. *kwreyu*. The PPt has the meaning 'equipped, provided with' (= TB *kekenu*). The middle present TA *knäṣtär* in A 71 a 2 is also rather intransitive, according Hackstein, 1995, 231f. ("der Wunsch erfüllt sich mir nicht"), and the same can be argued for the new attestations (for which see Carling, DThTA, s.v. *kän-*): A 309 a 2 *(knäṣt)r-äm ākāl rito* "the cherished wish is not fulfilled for them" (note that this restoration was already proposed by W. Siegling, pers. copy); THT 2457 a 3 //// *knäṣträ sätkatär* //// "occurs and spreads out"; THT 1463 a 6 *ṣyak kämsanträ* • "occur together with ...".

KAUSATIVUM I 'zustandekommen lassen, erfüllen; werden', 'fulfill (a wish);
   become' (tr/itr) (a+/a/a)
   Prs VIII (a+) —;-,-, *kämseñc* Imp —
     nt-Part *kämṣant*
     m-Part *knäsmāṃ*
     Ger I *kämṣäl* Abstr I —
     Inf *knässi*
   Sub IX (a) *knāsam*,-,-;— Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt II (itr) (a) -,-, *kakäṃ*;—
   PPt —
   Ipv I/III (a) *pkanā-ñi*;—
Pace Kim, 2009, 29, fn. 36, the Pt II *kakäṃ* attested in YQ 29 b 3 is intransitive;
cf. chap. Pt II 8.2.4. The respective imperative is, however, not one of Class II;
see chap. Ipv 37.3.
ETYM. PIE *√ĝenh₁ 'erzeugen' (²LIV, 163ff.); see Hackstein, 1995, 323ff.; Adams,
DoT, 160. The two most notable stems from this root are a completely
irregular preterit stem PT *käkænā-, which could be used both transitively
and intransitively, and no doubt derived from the PIE active perfect *ĝe-
ĝonh₁-e (continued still without addition of a final PT *-ā- in the PPt PT
*kækænäwä), and a subjunctive stem PT *känā-, probably based on the PIE
root aorist *ĝenh₁-to and showing analogical depalatalization of the root
initial, which may have imposed its final PT *-ā- on the old active perfect
stem.

ᴬ*känts°-s-* 'anerkennen, bestätigen, bekennen', 'acknowledge, confess' (tr)
   (m+/-/-)
   Prs VIII (m+) —; *kāntsāsamtär*,-,- Imp —
     nt-Part *kāṃtsāṣant*
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —
SEM. According to Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 51f. = Winter, 2005, 435f., with fn. 2,
TA *kāṃtsāṣantāṃ* in A 243 b 1 is the equivalent of Skt. *pratijña-*, so that the
root has the meaning 'anerkennen, bestätigen, bekennen'; see also Hackstein,
1993a, 148f. and Pinault, 2008, 283f. ETYM. Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 52 = Winter,
2005, 436 interpret the stem as "— formal allerdings unregelmäßige —
Kausativbildung zu dem einfachen Verb TA *känts-**, das in *kñasäṣt* bezeugt
ist", "irregular", because a suffix TA *-ās-* is otherwise only attested with
subjunctive stems from kausativum paradigms (but see below), that is to say,
s-presents from roots with A-character make the roots lose A-character

(except synchronically monosyllabic roots such as ᴬ*lyā*- that descriptively lacked A-character). Adams, 1988a, 32 and Hilmarsson, 1991a, 100; 1996, 78 argue that the stem directly continues the PIE *-sk̂e/o- present *(ĝi)-ĝn̥h₃-sk̂e/o- (both only differ slightly on the phonological development). Hackstein, 1993a, 148ff.; 1995, 100f. returns to the explanation of VW I, 204f., due to phonological problems with Hilmarsson's scenario, and plausibly sets up a denominative *käntsā- (assumed to belong to a TA noun †*känts* 'approval, acknowledgement') by referring to *wināsk-*/TA *winās-* 'venerate' from *wīna* 'pleasure'.

käm- 'kommen', 'come' (itr) (x/x/x)

        Prs Xa (x) -,-, *känmaṣṣäṃ*;-,-, *känmaskeṃ* | -,-, *känmastär*;— Imp —
               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub II (x) -, *śämt* (MQ), *śanmäṃ*/*śamn*=/*śman-me*;-,-, *śanmeṃ* |
             -,-, *śamtär*;— Opt -,-, *śäṇmi-ne* (MQ);-,-, *śänmīyeṃ*/
             śänmyeṃ | *śänmīmar*/*śmīmar*/*śanmīmar* (sic),-, *śmītär*/
             sänmitär;—
             Ger II *śmälle* (MQ)/*śänmalle* Abstr II
             śänmalñe/*śinmalñe*/*śmalñe*
             Priv — Inf *śamtsi*
        Pt III (m) -, *kamtsatai, kamtsate*;-,-, *kamtsante*
        Pt VI (a) *kamau, śem, śem*/*śemo*/*śema-ñ*; *kmem*,-,
             kameṃ/*kmeṃ-ne*/*śemare*
         PPt *kekamu*/*kekmu* | *kekamoṣ*/*kekmoṣ*
         Ipv III (a) *kamp* (sic); *kamtso*

On the attestations of the Sub, see Peyrot, 2008, 147. A 3.sg.mid. Pt *kamtsate* is attested in PK AS 6A b 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The 1.sg.act. Pt *kamau* that is listed in TEB I, 254, § 453 without reference, is attested in the small fragment THT 1615 frg. a b 2 (MQ): *ecce kamau •* "I came hither". The 2.sg. Pt *śem* is attested in PK NS 48 + 258 a 3; see Pinault, 1994, 184ff. A 2.sg. variant *śemt* does not exist; see chap. Pt VI. The 3.pl. Pt variant *śemare* is attested in the graffito G-Su 35 and is most certainly an analogical form belonging to the informal styles of Tocharian B; see Pinault, 1987, 152 and Peyrot, 2008, 136; *śemare* is immediately followed by the regular 3.pl. *kameṃ*, which Pinault hence interprets as a gloss on the aberrant form. Schmidt, first 1994b, 272f., most recently 2000, 226 restores a 2.pl. Ipv *[k](a)m(ts)o* in 108 a 10 contra TochSprR(B), ad loc. fn. 18. The original manuscript is lost, but Schmidt seems to possess an old photograph of the manuscript, so one could trust his reading. Winter, 1984a, 119 = 2005, 264 interprets *śka kamp* in 331 b 3 as "the otherwise unattested singular active imperative of B *käm-* 'come'" with the meaning "come here!", which fits the contexts very well (cf. the translation of the whole passage in Hilmarsson, 1991a, 89). Winter, l.c., and Kim, 2001, 122, fn. 9 take final -*p* being due to an orthographic inversion of †*pkam*, which is, of course, a suggestive solution,

but orthographic inversions are more usual with multipart akṣaras (cf. *lykautkañ* instead of *klyautkañ* in the letter 496, 7 — on which see, however, Pinault, 2008, 30 —, or *lpaṅka* for *plaṅka* in PK Cp 35, 50). Since *śka* is restricted to the eastern variety/informal styles of TB (see Stumpf, 1990, 104; Winter, 1984a, 122 = 2005, 267), there is also the possibility that the *°p* may be due to genuinely linguistic inversion of the two ingredients of †*pkam* occurring in these same styles. Note that the 2.pl. *[k](a)[m](ts)o* is likewise attested in an eastern text. On the Priv *ekamätte* 'which has not come, future' attesting to the former existence of an athematic Sub I, see Hilmarsson, 1991, 105f. and 1994, 48.

= ^A*kum-* 'kommen', 'come' (itr) (x/x/-)

        Prs X (x) *kumsam,-, kumnäṣ;-,-, kumseñc/kumse|*

                -,-, kumnäṣtär;-,-, kumsantär

                Imp *-,-, kumṣā;-,-, kumṣār*

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf *kumnässi*

        Sub II (x) *-,-, śmäṣ;-, śmäc, śmeñc| —;-,-, śmantär*

               Opt *-,-, śmiṣ; śmimäs,-,-| śmimār,-,-; śmimtär,-,-*

               Ger II *śmäl* Abstr II *śämlune*

        Pt III in

        PPt *kakmu*

        Ipv III (a) -; *pukmäs*

TG, 429 lists a possible equivalent of the TB Pt VI, i.e., 3.sg. Pt TA *kmā-ṃ*, a form taken from "übriggebliebenen kleinen Fragmenten" (see TochSprR(A), 222, ad no. 399-404). In my opinion, the form is to be found in THT 1411 frg. c a 4. On this form and on the apparent non-existence of a finite preterit in TA, see chap. Pt VI, fn. 4.

Sᴇᴍ. The verb is intransitive, but as a verb of motion it can be constructed with an obliquus of direction (see Thomas, 1983, 15). The TB middle has the meaning 'zusammenkommen mit', whereas in TA there does not seem to be a semantic difference between active and middle forms (see Schmidt, 1974, 472ff.). Eᴛʏᴍ. Traditionally connected with PIE *√gʷem '(wohin) gehen, kommen' (²LIV, 209f.); Adams, DoT, 161f.; Hackstein, 1995, 305ff. in detail. On the preterit, see Pinault, 1994, 190ff.; Widmer, 2001, 182ff.; Kim, 2001, 122ff.; and chap. Pt VI. On the Sub stem, see chap. Sub II 19.2. On the Prs stem, see Klingenschmitt, 1994, 409 = 2005, 433 fn. 170 (*gʷm̥-sk̂e/o- > *kän-sk(')ä/æ- with subsequent introduction of the *-m-* from the root allomorph *käm-*). See also chap. Prs X 33.2., fn. 1.

kärk²- '(an)binden', 'bind' (tr) (—)

        Prs IXa — Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I *kärkaṣṣäle* Abstr I *karkäṣṣälyñe*

Sub — Opt —
　　　　Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
　　　　Inf —
Pt I in
PPt *kärkau* ꞌu (MQ)
Pt III in
PPt *kekkärku* (MQ)
Ipv —

The Ger I *kärkaṣäle* is attested in the magical text 505 b 4 (reading according to K. T. Schmidt apud SHT 3, 902, h; see also Schmidt, 2000, 227; the context is damaged, but Schmidt, p.c., nevertheless translates "(Blut) ist zum Stillstand zu bringen") and in addition we have *kärkaṣṣäl[l]e* in the bilingual "Zaubertext (?)" SHT 8, 1815 b 1 (reading according to K. T. Schmidt, s.v. SHT; see now THT 3187). The Abstr *karkäṣṣälyñe* is found in the small fragment THT 2386 frg. t a 3 without context: //// *lyñemeṃ karkaṣṣalyñe upā(sake)* //// (differently Tamai, 2007a, s.v.; no site mark signature, MQ character uncertain). *kärkalle* in 319 b 1 (MQ) does not belong here, but is rather to be taken as an attestation of the noun *kärkālle* 'muddy pond'; see Schmidt, first 1984, 152f. and most recently Pinault, 2006, 109f.; we are dealing with Pāt 59, a fact apparently seen by Schmidt, judging by his translation of *kwele* in 1984, 153, but not mentioned — hence the form is most likely a term of color referring to a monk's garment. For the Sanskrit passage, see von Simson, 2000, 297. For *kärskemane* and *kärṣalya* that WTG, 230 analyzes as kausativum forms of this root, see *kärsk-* '?'. Note the existence of two different preterit stems on the evidence of the attested PPts, and the fact that the PPt from Pt I seems homonymic with that from *kärkᵃ-* 'rob, steal'. To be sure, on account of the TA evidence we would expect only a Pt III, and not a Pt I at all. The PPt belonging to Pt III (*kekkärkū* in 142 b 3) certainly means 'is bound': *täṃmäṣle srukallesa māka kekkärkū* "Der Geborene ist völlig an den Tod gebunden", cf. Carling, 2000, 74. The same is true for the obvious PPt to a Pt I *kärkau* ꞌu in 135 a 4 (see Saito, 2006, 448), and the noun *kärkaucana* in H add.149 89 a 8: *(pi)lko palsko kärkaucana* "binding the mind [and] the opinion/glance"; see Broomhead I, 117f. and WTG, 44, § 36,2. The other attestations of such a PPt are less clear. The oblique *kärkoṣ* in St. Ch. 00316.a.1 a 4 is analyzed by WTG, 230 as a PPt from this root based on the reading by Sieg (see also Sieg, 1955, 70; Broomhead I, 45, and TEB II, no. XXX, 12 with fn. 2), but Adams, DoT, 162 sets up a different root ³*kärk-* 'sprout' for this instance, i.e., translates 'germinated grain' instead of 'grain bound [to the roots]' (thus again Saito, 2006, 448), which makes much more sense. *kärkoṣ* in the small fragment THT 1419 frg. g a 3 is unclear: //// *[wai]ptāyar*\ *karkoṣ tākaṃ* • "will be ... separately" (differently Tamai, 2007a, s.v.).
= ᴬ**kärk-** 'binden', 'bind' (tr) (-/a/a)
　　　　Prs — Imp —
　　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　　m-Part —
　　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —

Inf —
Sub VII (a) *kärkñam,-,* *kärkñäṣ;* — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt III (a) —;-,-, *śarkr-äm*
PPt *kakärku*
Ipv —

An Opt from this root seems further attested in the small fragment THT 2401
b 1: *karkñi ////,* cf. Carling, DThTA, s.v. *kärk-.*
Etym. Fränkel, 1932, 229 compares Lith. *keřgti* 'bind' from PIE *√kergʰ
(Hilmarsson, 1996, 87f.: *√kergᵘʰ); see Adams, DoT, 162.

kärk^ᵃ- 'wegnehmen, stehlen, beseitigen', 'rob, steal, remove' (tr) (m/-/m)
    Prs VI (m) — Imp -,-, *kärkänoytär* (MQ); —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *kärknāmane*
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf *kärkatsi* (Š)/*karkatsi* (Š)
    Pt I (m) -,-, *kärkāte;-,-, kärkānte-ne*
    PPt *kärkau| kärkoṣ*
    Ipv —

The Imp *kärkänoytär* is attested in THT 1312 b 1 (metrical, MQ): //// (·)*ra po*
krokśa krent weresā [*ma*]*ntrakka sā͡u eśaina karka*[*n*]*oyt*[*ra*] || (differently
read by Tamai, s.v.) "... every good bee (obl.) by the smell, just so she removes
the eyes"; the *m*-Part *kärknāmane* is attested in PK AS 15D a 3 (unpublished,
reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; possibly Broomhead II, 72 also refers to
this form, but with an incorrect short -*a*- and the wrong line). Broomhead, l.c.,
wrongly analyzes the *m*-Part as a form of *kärk*- 'bind', thus also Hilmarsson,
1996, 87. The *mo*-adj. *kärkänamo* from BM 1 b 6 (MQ) also belongs here (the
meaning of the passage is not clear; see Malzahn, 2007a, 271 with fn. 17). A
PPt *karkau* with the clear meaning 'stolen' is attested in IOL Toch 730 b 1 (the
texts contains NiḥsPāt 6 or 7; see now also Peyrot, 2007, s.v.); accordingly, this
root and *kärk*- 'bind' seem to have homonymic PPt formations (see above).
= ^A**kärk^ᵃ-** 'wegnehmen, stehlen', 'rob, steal' (tr) (—)
    Prs VI — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf *kärnātsi*
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

ETYM. Hilmarsson, 1996, 87 basically following Van Windekens derives the verb from a PIE root *√h₂greg (sic, not in ²LIV).

kärtk²- '± verfallen, vermodern', '± decay, moulder' (?) (a/-/-)

    Prs IX (a) -,-, *kärtkäṣṣäṃ* (MQ); — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt III in
    PPt in *kekärtkorṣṣe*
    Ipv —

SEM. The semantics of the verbal forms are quite uncertain; see, e.g., Hilmarsson, 1996, 96. The adj. *kekärtkorṣṣe* is attested in the MQ text PK AS 12K b 5 (metrical, 11 syllables): || *tuñänma kekartkorṣṣe ṣpe[l]cc[eṃ] – – ////* (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.) "blossoms, ... [and] ...". The passage deals with the episode of the Bodhisattva's encounter with the dead on the vehicle (parts of text PK AS 12K, but not this passage, are translated by Couvreur, 1953, 282f.). The second attestation 259 a 1 is hopeless, because the object *oñtn(e)* is an unknown hapax as well (apparently taken as a locative by TochSprR(B)). Therefore, the root meaning is rather to be established through the derived nouns *kärkkālle/kärtkālle* (attested in PK NS 107 b 4 and PK AS 15A a 5; see Pinault, 2006, 109) and TA *kärtkāl*. On the basis of the assumption that the TB noun *kärkkālle/kärtkālle* has the meaning '± swamp, marsh' rather than the meaning 'pool' traditionally assigned to it, Adams, DoT, 163 (with ref.) proposes a root meaning '± defile oneself; defecate'. Schmidt, 1984, 152f.; 1985, 429 also seems to argue that *kärkalle* attested in the MQ text 319 b 1 refers to the 'color of mud' of a monk's garment, since we are dealing with Pāt 59 (for the Sanskrit rule, see von Simson, 2000, 297) as to be inferred from the Schmidt's translation of *kwele*. However, Pinault, 2006, 109 shows that the TA equivalent rather means "une pièce d'eau, étang ou fontaine" and not "boue". Hence, Pinault argues that the basic meaning of the noun was rather "une pièce d'eau, point d'eau", from which the TB meaning "bourbe, fange, boue" developed secondarily via "eau stagnante", "marais". For the root *kärtk-* Pinault consequently sets up the tentative meaning "dont on peut puiser, tirer (scil. de l'eau)", or "dont il peut jaillir (scil. de l'eau)". ETYM. See Adams, DoT, 163.

kärn²- 'schlagen', 'hit, beat' (tr) (—)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —

Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
Inf —

Pt III in
PPt *kekarnoṣ|* in *kekkarnor*
Ipv —

Saito, 2006, 400f. correctly restores //// *k karnor* (as H 149.315 b 4 is rendered by Sieg/Siegling, 1932, 491) to *(ke)kkarnor*, i.e., an abstract from a PPt belonging to a Pt III, which can now be supported by the attestation of an obl.sg. //// *kekarnoṣạ* in the small fragment IOL Toch 980 b 2 (cf. now also Tamai, 2007, s.v.). A PPt to a Pt III is also supported by the fact that a PPt made to a Pt I (as set up by the manuals) should show the root allomorph *kärn-*. Accordingly, there is no †*kärnau* 'versehrt' as in ²LIV, 328. The Inf *kärnātsi* in 366 b 2 does not belong here (thus WTG, 231), but to *käry-* 'buy', according to Couvreur, 1954, 86.

KAUSATIVUM III 'Schmerz bereiten', 'inflict pain' (tr) (−)

Prs IXb — Imp —
  nt-Part *karnnäṣṣeñca* (sic)
  m-Part —
  Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —
  Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
  Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *karnäṣṣäṃ* in TEB I, 212, § 381 is most likely only reconstructed on the evidence of the *m*-Part. Pace WTG, 231, the kausativum has a meaning different from that of the grundverb, although we do not seem to be dealing with valency opposition. *karnnäṣṣeñca* in 197 b 6 (bis) is the attribute of *upekṣ* 'sense of indifference' and parallel to *mā parākäṣṣeñca* 'not causing happiness', and therefore means 'inflicting pain' (thus Sieg/Siegling, 1932, 493 on behalf of Skt. *upatāpin-* 'inflicting pain'). The same form is restored by Thomas, 1993, 193 in H 149.148 (= U 24) a 2 as the equivalent of Pā. *anūpaghato* 'not killing'.

= ᴬ*kärn-* 'schlagen', 'hit, beat' (tr) (-/-/a)

Prs VIII — Imp —
  nt-Part —
  m-Part *kärnäsmāṃ*
  Ger I — Abstr I —
  Inf —
Sub IX — Opt —
  Ger II — Abstr II *kärnāṣlune*
Pt II (a) -,-, *kakräṃ;—*
PPt *kakärnu*
Ipv —

Non-palatalized 3.sg. Pt II *kakräṃ* is evidently based on the PPt, which is to be equated with the TB PPt that seems to belong to a Pt III.

ETYM. The root is traditionally taken for the result of a reanalysis of a nasal present from PIE *√k̑erh₂ 'brechen (itr)' (²LIV, 327f.); see Hackstein, 1995, 34 with ref., but this etymology could not account for the preservation of -*rn*-; I therefore follow Adams, DoT, 164 in setting up pre-PT *kru-n- (from "PIE *kreu-s- '± strike'").

käry³- 'kaufen, handeln', 'buy, trade' (tr) (m/m/x)

　　　Prs Xa (m) -,-, *kärnāstär*; — Imp —
　　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　　m-Part *kärnāskemane*
　　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
　　　Sub VI (m) *kärnāmar*,-, *kärnātär*; — Opt —
　　　　　　Ger II — Abstr II *kärnālñe* Priv —
　　　　　　Inf *kärnātsi*/*kärnāsi*
　　　Pt I (x) —; *käryām*,-,- | *käryāmai*, *käryātai*, *käryāte*; *käryāmnte* (sic),-,-
　　　PPt *käryau* | *käryoṣ*
　　　Ipv —

The 1.sg. Sub is attested in the small fragment THT 3034 b 2 (cf. also the Inf on the recto side). The 3.sg. Sub *kärnātär* 'buys (himself)' is attested in PK NS 95 b 3, the Abstr *kärnālñe* in PK NS 95 a 4, and the PPt nom.sg. *käryau* often in the same text (see Pinault, 2000, 82). A 1.pl. Pt *käryāmnte* is often found in business documents; on the reading -*mnte*, not †-*mtte*, see Peyrot, 2008, 156. The Inf *kärnātsi* in 366 b 2 also belongs here, according to Couvreur, 1954, 86 (thus also TEB II, 182; contra WTG, 231). The variant *kärnāsi* is found in the monastery record PK Cp 37, 22, and the 3.sg. Pt *käryāte* in PK Cp 37, 11 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 3.sg. Pt also in a graffito (see Schmidt, 2008, 517, 522). A present form is also to be restored in THT 1295 b 4: //// *rṣṣapi naumiyentse tañ kärnāske* //// "of your ... jewel ... buy". SEM. The sole active form 1.pl. *käryām* is attested with certainty. ETYM. PIE *√kʷreih₂ 'eintauschen' (²LIV, 395f.); see Schmidt, 1982, 365; in detail Hackstein, 1995, 312ff.; and Adams, DoT, 165.

ᴬkäry- 'bedenken, bestimmen', 'consider' (tr) (a/-/-)

　　　Prs VIII (a) -,-, *käryäṣ*; — Imp —
　　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　　m-Part —
　　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
　　　　　　Inf —
　　　Sub IX — Opt —
　　　　　　Ger II — Abstr II *käryāṣlune*
　　　Pt —
　　　PPt —
　　　Ipv —

According to Isebaert, 1992, 290, TA *akritaṃ* (loc.) from *akrit is a privativum from this root, and to be derived from "*æn-käryātæ 'non considéré'" (which is, however, phonologically impossible), but Carling, DThTA, s.v. *akri* now rather reads TA *akri taṃ* in any case. ETYM. Hilmarsson, 1996, 99 derives the root from a zero grade *kri- of a root that is now set up as PIE *√kreh₁(i̯) 'sieben, trennen' by ²LIV, 366f. (without the Toch. verb). Note that within the system of Hackstein and Hilmarsson, PIE *krih₁-C- could only have resulted in pre-PT *krī-C-.

kärr^ᵃ- 'schelten', 'scold, rebuke' (tr) (m/m/m)

    Prs V (m) -,-, *kärratär* (sic); — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I *kärrälle* Abstr I —
    Sub V (m) *kärrāmar*,-, *kärrātär-me*; — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt I (m) -,-, *kärrāte*; —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

The 1.sg.mid. Sub *kärrāmar* is only listed in TEB II, 182 without ref.; a 3.sg.mid. Pt *kärrāte* is attested in the small fragment THT 3128 b 1 (also listed in TEB II, 182 without ref.). The form *kärrātär-me* in 116 frg. 9 (now = THT 1575 frg. b a 4) is without much context, so it may as well be a present form (see Couvreur, 1954, 86 contra WTG); a present form is now beyond any doubt attested in PK Cp 37, 30: *ñake vipaiśe śātre aitsi mā ka[r]ra[tar̠](̇)* (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.): "Now Vipaiśe does not disapprove of the giving of grain". The vowels in this very long letter are normally written correctly, but *kärratär* should nevertheless be interpreted as a misspelling for *kärrātär* rather than as a Prs II, because the attested gerundive forms are certainly Ger I, and not Ger II. ETYM. As per Adams, DoT, 706.

kärś- 'zerhacken', 'chop up' (tr) (a/a/-)

    Prs IXa (a) —;-,-, *kärśäskeṃ* (MQ) Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub IV (a) -,-, *kärśi-ñ*;-,-, *kärśye-ñ* (MQ) Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt VII in
    PPt *kekarśwa*
    Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs *karśaskeṃ* is attested in THT 2247 b 1 (pace Tamai, 2007a, s.v.), the 3.sg. Sub *kärśi-ñ* in PK AS 16.7 b 1 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). *kärśye-ñ* (for *kärśye<ṃ>-ñ*) is correctly analyzed as a subjunctive instead of an optative by Hilmarsson, 1996, 94 (contra WTG, 231). The stem is set up here as *kärś-* on the evidence of the attested forms, the underlying stem may, however, be †*kärk-* (thus Adams, DoT, 162f., although there are already two homonymic roots *kärk-* 'bind' and *kärk^a-* 'rob', and even a third one 'sprout', according to Adams; see *kärk-* 'bind' above) or †*kärst-* (thus Hilmarsson, 1996, 94 and Winter 1977, 140 = 1984, 185 = 2005, 177, who sets up †*kärst-* on the evidence of semantically similar *kärst^a-* 'cut off'). Since a Sub IV is always associated with a Pt VII, the PPt *kekarśwa* does not attest to a Pt III, but is the expected formation to such a Pt VII; see chap. Pt VII.

^Akärṣt^a- 'cut off, destroy' → *kärst^a-* 'id.'

kärṣṣ- 'shoot' → *kärsk-* 'shoot (an arrow)'

kärs^(a)- 'wissen, verstehen, erkennen', 'know, understand, recognize' (tr)
        (x/x/x)
        Prs VI (x) *kärsänau* (MQ), *kärsänat* (MQ), *kärsanaṃ/ kärsnaṃ*; — |
            -,-, *kärsanatär*; —
            Imp —;-,-, *kärsanoyeṃ*
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I *kärsanalle/ kärsänalle* (MQ) Abstr I —
        Sub V (x) *kārsau, kārsāt* (MQ), *kārsaṃ*; — | -,-, *karsatär* (MQ); —
            Opt *karsoym,-, karsoy;-,-, karsoṃ* | -,-, *kärsoytär* (M); —
            Ger II *kärsälle* (MQ)/*kärsalyi* (sic) Abstr II *karsalñe* (sic)
            Inf *karsatsi* (sic)
        Pt I (x) *śärsāwa, śärsāsta, śarsa;-,-, śärsāre* | -,-, *kärsāte-ne*; —
        PPt *kärsau* | *kärsoṣ*
        Ipv I (a) *pkārsa; pkarsas/pkarsaso/pkärso* (MQ)
Instead of a 1.sg. Sub *kärsau-ne*, one has to read correct *kārsau-ne* in Amb b 2; see Thomas, 1965, 195. The 2.sg. Sub *kārsā(t)* is attested in PK AS 12E b 2 (MQ, unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The form *kärsoym* listed in TEB II, 182 is based on a restoration in the MQ text 229 a 5. The regular *karsoym* is attested quite often. In S 3 b 1 one has to read *karstoymar* (see Couvreur, 1954, 87; Thomas, 1966a, 167) instead of *karsoymar* (thus Lévi, followed by WTG, 231), i.e., a form of *kärst^a-* 'cut off'. The Abstr II is attested quite often, e.g., in IOL Toch 491 a 3. The 3.sg.mid. Pt *kärsāte-ne* is a gloss in SHT 7, 1704 (reading: K. T. Schmidt). The Ipv *pkarsas* is also attested in SHT 1, 768, 17 (= Lüders number X 682): *indr(a)s(·)nts[e] p[e]lkeṃ paikām ceṃ pkarsas*: "Wisset, [dass] wir diese Udānas für Indr(a)s(·) geschrieben haben", reading and translation according to Schmidt, 1974, 450f. The Ipv variant *pkarsaso* is also found in St. Ch. 00316.a.2 a 1 (see most recently Carling, 2003,

76); *pkärso* (MQ) in 284 b 7 cannot stand for *pkär<sa>so* by haplography, because the meter requires a disyllabic form; see chap. Ipv 37.1.

KAUSATIVUM IV 'wissen lassen, erkennen lassen, verkünden', 'make know(n), make recognize, announce' (tr) (a/a/a)

    Prs IXb (a) *śarsäskau,-, śarsäṣṣäṃ-ne;-,-, śarsäskeṃ-ne*

        Imp -,-, *śarsäṣṣi;-, śarsäṣṣicer,-*

        nt-Part —

        m-Part —

        Ger I *śarsaṣṣäle* (sic) Abstr I —

    Sub IXb (a) — Opt -,-, *śarsäṣṣi;* —

        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

        Inf —

    Pt II (a) -, *śārsasta-ne, śārsa;-,-, śārsare-ne*

    PPt *śeśśarsoṣ*

    Ipv I (m) *karsar;* —

The 1.sg. Prs *śarsäskau* is attested in PK AS 17J b 5, the 2.pl. Imp *śarsäṣṣicer* in PK NS 29 a 2 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), and the 2.sg. Pt *śārsasta-ne* in SI P/2 a 1 (Pinault, 2008, 300f.). The 3.pl. Pt *śārsare-ne* attested in PK NS 22 b 5 was already published by Lévi, 1933, 75, but with a wrong reading (G.-J. Pinault, p.c.); cf. also Pinault, 1990a, 56 for the manuscript. The Ger I *śarsaṣṣäle* is attested in KVāc 19 a 5 (see Schmidt, 1986, 52). The middle imperative of what is formally a grundverb stem Pt I has the semantics of a Kausativum form (cf. WTG, 232; Schmidt, 1974, 488f., fn. 1). On the morphology, see the discussion in chap. Ipv.

= *Akärs(ä)-* 'wissen, verstehen, erkennen', 'know, understand, recognize' (tr) (x/x/x)

    Prs VI (x) *kärsnām, kärsnāt, kärsnāṣ;-, kärsnāc, kärsneñc |*

        -,-, *kärsnātär;* —

        Imp —;-,-, *śārsar*

        nt-Part *kärsnānt*

        m-Part —

        Ger I *kärsnāl* Abstr I —

        Inf *kärsnātsi*

    Sub V (x) -,-, *krasaṣ;-,-, kärseñc/kärse | -,-, kärsātär;-, kärsācär,-*

        Opt —; *kärsimäs,-, kärsiñc*

        Ger II *kärsāl* Abstr II *kärsālune*

    Pt I (x) *śārsā,-, śārs;* — *| -,-, kärsāt;* —

    PPt *kärso*

    Ipv I (a) *päkras; pkärsäs*

According to M. Peyrot (p.c.), a 2.sg. Pt *(śä)rsāṣ(t)* can probably be restored in the small fragment IOL Toch 291 a 1. The restoration of a 3.pl. Pt TA *kra(sa)r* in A 450 a 4 (TG, 430 with question mark) is uncertain.

KAUSATIVUM IV 'wissen lassen, erkennen lassen, lehren', 'make know(n), teach' (tr) (a/-/a)

    Prs VIII (a) -, *śärsäṣt,-;* — Imp —

        nt-Part —

      m-Part *śärsäsmāṃ*
      Ger I — Abstr I —
      Inf *śärsässi*
  Sub — Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II —
  Pt II (a) -,-, *śaśärs;-,-, śaśärsār*
  PPt *śaśärsu*
  Ipv II (a) *pśärs;-*

ETYM. PIE *√kers '(ab)schneiden' (²LIV, 355f.); see the ref. in Kim, 2007b, 89, fn. 44; see also s.v. *kärst*ᵃ- 'cut off'.

kärsk- '(mit e. Pfeil) schießen', 'shoot (an arrow)' (tr) (-/-/a)
  Prs II — Imp —
      nt-Part —
      m-Part —
      Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub II — Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
      Inf —
  Pt I (a) -,-, *karṣṣa;*—
  PPt *kekarṣṣu*
  Ipv —

The manuals set up *kärṣṣ-* (WTG, 231; TEB II, 182) or *kärsk-* (Adams, DoT, 167) as root. According to Winter 1977, 140 = 1984, 185 = 2005, 177, the TA form *°krase* in TA *pärra-krase* '(distance of an) arrow shot' is a cognate of this TB root and therefore the TB root is *kärs-* ("morphophonemisch {krəs-}"). Winter's translation of the hapax TA *pärra-krase* in A 301 a 1 is now supported by the Old Turkish parallel MaitrHami XII; see Pinault, 2004a, 258, who restores and translates A 301 a 1: *(wälts ka)ṣas täprā śäk ṣäkpi pärra-krase wärtsā ñemiṣināṃ pyākäṣ wleṣāt* "er machte/schuf einen Juwelen-Pfosten, (tausend) Klafter hoch, sechzehn Pfeilschüsse breit". At any rate, in TB we have only forms with *-ṣṣ-*, so the TB root can be set up as one with a final *-sk-*, to which a palatalized preterit stem *kärṣṣā-* with a PPt *kekarṣṣu* could be expected to belong. Such a Pt I, in turn, would presuppose a thematic subjunctive and present stem of Class II. Adams, DoT, 167f. set up the root as *kärsk-* on the assumption that *kärskemane* and *kärṣalya* belong to the same root (followed by Hilmarsson, 1996, 93). Although these forms would fit nicely morphologically, they seem to have a meaning such as 'strew (flowers)' vel sim. (see below), so they are not easily connectable with TB *karṣṣa*, and *kekarṣṣu*, which both certainly refer to the 'shooting' of an 'arrow'.

kärsk- '?' (?) (—)
  Prs II — Imp —
      nt-Part —
      m-Part *kärskemane*
      Ger I *kärṣalya* Abstr I —

Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

kärskemane and *kärṣalya* are both only attested in the magical text Fill. M 3 a 4 and a 5 in a very unclear context. Lévi, 1936, 204f. has apparently taken *kärskemane* as a kind of kausativum form from *kärs*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'know': "she is to be known from her garland of suman flowers"; similarly Filliozat, 1948, 101: "se reconnaissant à un chapelet de Guilandina Bonduc", with the explanation "Grains servant à former les chapelets de *rudrākṣa*". However, the expected kausativum form of *kärs*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'know' would be †*śarsäskemane*. According to Sieg, 1955, 81 (followed by Dietz, 1981, 115), Fill. M 3 a 4 has to be read and translated: *(pān)to vidyādhare e(tte)sa paiyne etswai piṅkalle sumānṣeṃ warkensa māladaṇḍik kärskemane* "als (Beista)nd [ist] gegenüber unten zu [ihren] Füßen ein Vidyādhara zu malen, mit Stricken (?) (lies *warkensa*) aus Sumanā[-Blumen] die Māldaṇḍikā bindend". The form *kärṣalya* in line a 5 also refers to *sumānṣeṃ warkensa*. WTG, 230 and TEB II, 182 hence take both forms as kausativum forms from *kärk-* 'bind'. Adams, DoT 167f. rejects this assumption on phonological and semantic grounds and sets up a root *kärsk-* 'propel, i.e. shoot, throw' instead (followed by Hilmarsson, 1996, 93). To be sure, "strewing flowers" is not an odd translation for the passage. Although morphologically fitting, a connection with *karṣṣa* and *kekarṣṣu* is nevertheless problematic, because these forms seem to have the rather special semantics 'shoot (an arrow)' (see s.v. *kärsk-* above), which is not a likely meaning for *kärskemane* and *kärṣalya*. Therefore, the forms are kept separate here. We have to do with a Prs II from an *sk*-root, not with an *sk*-present from a root *kär-*.

kärst- → *kärś-* 'chop up'

kärstᵃ- 'abschneiden, zerstören', 'cut off, destroy' (tr) (x/x/x)
    Prs VI (x) -,-, *karsnaṃ;*-,-, *karsnaṃ* | -,-, *kärsnātär;*-,-, *kärsnāntär*
        Imp —;-,-, *kärsnoyeñ-c*
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *kärsnāmane*
        Ger I *kärsnālya* Abstr I —
    Sub V (x) -,-, *krāstäṃ* (Š, sic);— Opt *karstoym, kärstoyt* (MQ),-;— |
        karstoymar,-, karstoytär,—
        Ger II — Abstr II *kärstalyñe* (MQ) Priv *eṅkärstātte* (MQ)
        Inf *karstatsi*
    Pt I (x) *kärstāwa,-, karsta;*— | -, *kärstātai, kärstāte;*—
    PPt *kärstau* | *kärstoṣ*
    Ipv I (a) *pkrāsta; pkarstas*

Instead of a 2.sg. Prs *kärsnāt* (WTG, 232), one has to read a 3.sg. Pt *kärstā-c* in H add.149 88 a 7, according to Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 214. A 3.sg. Prs *kärsnaṃ* (MQ) is also attested in THT 3599 frg. a b 5: //// *(pa)rm̠aṅkyo k̠arsnaṃ 37*, cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 278: "schneidet (ihm) die Hoffung ab". The 3.pl. *karsnaṃ* is attested in PK AS 7M b 4 (+ NS 122a + NS 261 + NS 262) (reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), and the 3.pl.mid. *kärsnā(ntär)* is restored by TochSprR(B), transl., 29 in 18 b 2. The 3.sg.mid. *karsnatär* in the letter PK Cp 32, 12 has to be an error (cf. Pinault, 1984a, 27); the 3.sg. Sub *krāstäṃ* in 33 a 3 is no mere misspelling for †*krāstaṃ* (as per Cowgill, 1967, 178 = 2006, 449), nor a Sub I or II (as per WTG, 126, § 123; TEB I, 230, § 413,3), but shows occasional weakening of -*ā*- to -*ä*-; see chap. Sub I/V 18.2.1. The 1.sg. Opt *karstoym* is found in PK NS 28 b 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 2.sg. Opt *kärstoyt* in THT 1540 frg. a a 5 (see Schmidt, 2007, 325). Instead of the strange Ger II *k̠arsṭālya* (sic) read by Filliozat in Fill. M 2 a 3, one has to read Ger I *kärsnālya* (see Sieg, 1955, 80); 1.sg. Opt *karstoymar* is found in S 3 b 1 (see Couvreur, 1954, 87; Thomas, 1966a, 167 with fn. 6). The 2.sg.mid. Pt *kärstātai* is attested without context in the small fragment THT 1540 frg. d a 2 (see Schmidt, 2007, 329). A 2.pl. Ipv *pkarsta(s)* seems further to be attested in THT 1295 b 1: • *ñi yeṣ̠ āś pkarsta(s)* "you (pl.), cut off my head!".

= *Akärṣt̠ᵃ*- 'abschneiden, zerstören', 'cut off, destroy' (tr) (x/-/m)

    Prs VI (x) -,-,-, *kärṣnāṣ;-,-,-, kärṣneñc|* — ;-,-,-, *kärṣnāntär* Imp —
        nt-Part *kärṣnānt*
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf *kärṣnātsi*
    Sub V — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *kärṣtālune*
    Pt I (m) *kärṣte,-, kärṣtāt;* —
    PPt *kärṣto*
    Ipv —

ETYM. A denominative to an abstract in *-teh₂- from PIE *√kers '(ab)schneiden' (²LIV, 355f.); cf. Adams, DoT, 169.

käl- '(er)tragen', 'bear, endure, suffer' (tr) (a/a/x)

    Prs VIII (a) -,-, *kälṣäṃ* (MQ);-,-, *kälseṃ* (MQ) Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub I (a) *kelu,-,-;* — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv *ekältte* (MQ)
        Inf *kaltsi*
    Pt III (x) -, *kelasta, keltsa;* — | *kälsāmai,-,-;* —
    PPt —
    Ipv III (a) *pkel;-*

The 1.sg.mid. Pt *kälsāmai* is attested in PK AS 13I a 7 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). D. Q. Adams (p.c.) points out that the noun *kleñcaṃ* 'rafter' (= Skt. *pārśukā-* 'Dachsparren'; see SWTF, s.v.) attested in PK AS 6 A (see Pinault, 1990, 57) looks like an irregular Part of this root (note the lack of root-final palatalization).

= ᴬ*käl-* '(er)tragen', 'bear, endure, suffer' (tr) (-/-/a)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *kläsmāṃ*
                Ger I *kälṣäl* Abstr I —
                Inf *klässi*
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II (a) -, *kaklāṣt, kakäl;-,-, kaklār*
        PPt —
        Ipv II (a) *pkäl;-*

A 2.sg. Prs *kläṣt* may be attested in the small fragment THT 2154 a 2, according to Carling, DThTA, s.v. The PPt TA *klo* in A 392 b 1 does not belong to this root, but to TA *käl�⁸-* 'lead'; see Couvreur, 1966, 177; Thomas, 1969a, 311, fn. 130.

Eᴛʏᴍ. Usually connected with PIE *√kel 'antreiben' (²LIV, 348f. with ref.), which is semantically not very convincing; according to Seržant, 2008, 70ff., from a transitive (!) perfect "*kekolh₃-/*kekl̥h₃-" of the root PIE *√kelh₃ 'sich erheben'.

*käl*ᵃ*-* 'führen, bringen', 'lead, bring' (tr) (x/x/x)

        Prs Xa (x) *källāskau,-, källāṣṣäṃ/ kälāṣn* (Š); *klāskem* (S),-,
                källāskeṃ-ne|-,-, källāstär/klāstär (MQ);— Imp -,-, *klāṣṣi;—*
                nt-Part *källāṣṣeñca*
                m-Part —
                Ger I *källāṣṣälle/ klāṣle* Abstr I —
        Sub V (x) -, *kālat-neśco* (MQ), *kālaṃ;— |*
                kälamār (MQ), *kalatar, kalatär;—*
                Opt *kaloym,-,-;— |-,-, kaloytar* (sic);—
                Ger II *kalalle* Abstr II *kalalyñe* (MQ) Priv —
                Inf *kalatsi*
        Pt I (x) -,-, *śala;-,-, śilāre-ne| klāmai, klātai, klāte; klāmnte* (S),-, *klānte*
        PPt *kälau*
        Ipv I (x) *pkāla; kalas* (S) | *pkalar; pkalat*

The 1.sg. Prs *källāskau* is restored by TochSprR(B) in 92 a 6 (cf. also the translation by Schmidt, 2000, 322), the 1.pl.mid. Prs *kl[ǎ]s[k]e(mtär)* likewise in 589 b 7 (1.pl. is certain on the evidence of *wes* 'we', but the voice remains uncertain). The 3.sg. Imp *klāṣṣi* is attested in THT 1556 b 4 (M. Peyrot, p.c.). The 3.sg. Sub *kālaṃ* can be read in IOL Toch 760 a 3 (see Peyrot, 2007, s.v.), whereas the 3.sg. Opt *kaloytär* listed in TEB I, 228, § 228,2 is probably only

reconstructed. The Ger variant *klāṣle* is the usual form found in caravan travel passes (and also in 10 b 6). It shows informal degemination of *-ll-* and *-ṣṣ-* and the syncope of *ä* in the resulting open syllables. The same development is found in the eastern 1.pl. form *klāskem* (S), and in some metrical variants (even in MQ texts, cf. 3.sg.mid. *klāsträ* in 37 b 3). The subjunctive shows persistent initial accent and ablaut. On the 1.pl.mid. Pt *klāmnte* (not †*klāmtte*), see Peyrot, 2008, 155ff. Pace Saito, 2006, 95, the PPt is indeed attested (in H 149.314 a 3, as listed in WTG, 233).

KAUSATIVUM IV 'führen lassen', 'let lead (the way)' (tr) (-/-/m)

       Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
       Pt II (m) *śālamai* (MQ),-,-; —
       PPt —
       Ipv II (m) -; *śālāt* (MQ)

According to Schmidt, 1974, 300, there is no noticeable semantic difference between the grundverb and the kausativum *śālamai* in 19 b 7: *brahmalokäś tā͜u ytāri śālamai*, which he translates: "führte mich(?) [ging(?)] den Weg zur Brahmawelt", but I do not see why we should not translate: "I made the way lead to the Brahmaloka [on my behalf]".

= *Akäl*ᵃ- 'führen, bringen', 'lead, bring' (tr) (x/x/x)

       Prs VI (x) -, *källāt, källāṣ;* — | *källāmār,-,-;-,-, källāṃtär* Imp —
            nt-Part *källānt*
            m-Part *källāmāṃ*
            Ger I *källāl* Abstr I —
            Inf *källātsi*
       Sub V (x) *kalam,-,-;-,-, kleñc* | *klāmār, klātār, klātär;-, klācär,-*
            Opt -,-, *kliṣ;* — | -, *klitār,-;* —
            Ger II *klāl* Abstr II *klālune*
       Pt I (x) *ślā,-, śäl;-,-, kalar* | *kle, klāte, klāt;-,-, klānt*
       PPt *klo*
       Ipv I (m) *päklār;-*

The 3.sg. Sub TA *klāträ* (TG: "Frgm.") can be found in THT 1642 frg. d b 3 (cf. Carling, DThTA, s.v.), the Ger II TA *(klā)l* is restored in A 70 b 3 (see Sieg, Übers. II, 44, fn. 5). A 2.pl.mid. Ipv TA *päklāc* is only listed in TEB I, 268 without ref. TA *pukal* in A 20 a 3 does not belong to this root (thus TG, 431), but to *Apäk-* 'cook' (see s.v.). The manuals (TG, 431, etc.) list two 3.sg. Sub forms with following clitic, i.e., TA *klāṣ-äṃ* (A 146 b 4) and TA *klāṣ-äm* (A 395 b 2), but this is problematic, because the expected respective 3.sg. from this subjunctive would be TA **kalaṣ-äm.* Hence, both forms may rather belong to *Aklāw*ᵃ- 'fall': A 146 b 5 //// *lapā klāṣ-äṃ* "it will fall on his [= the embryo's]

head"; A 395 b 2 is fragmentary, but "(danger ?) will fall on us" makes at least as much sense as "wird uns bringen" (as per Krause, 1971, 39). TA *klintar* in A 343 a 4 belongs to *ᴬkli-n-* 'be obliged to'.

ETYM. According to Adams, DoT, 170 and ²LIV, 386f. to be derived from PIE *√kʷelh₁ 'turn (tr/itr)'; differently, Hackstein, 1995, 314ff. (PIE *√kelh₁ 'treiben'); see most recently Seržant, 2008, 59ff. and Kim, 2009, 15, fn. 11.

*ᴬ**kälk**ᵃ-* 'go' → *kālāk*ᵃ- 'follow'

käln- 'tönen, hallen', 'resound' (itr) (a/-/m)

        Prs II (a) —;-,-, *kalnem* Imp -,-, *kalñi*; —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt III (m) -,-, *kälnsāte*; —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

According to Schmidt, 1985, 426, the present stem is thematic, and not athematic (thus, e.g., TEB II, 183), on the evidence of the 3.pl. ending -*em*. But since athematic paradigms often simply adopt the thematic 3.pl. ending, the stem originally should have been as athematic as in TA. Instead of *kälnsāte* (thus WTG, 234), Couvreur, 1954, 89 rather wants to read *kältsāte* in H 149.69 b 3 (followed by Broomhead I, 158). Judging by the ductus of the manuscripts, both readings are possible both for H 149.69 b 3 (see IOL Toch 19) and for the second attestation in 617 a 4. The context of H 149.69 b 3, however, speaks in favor of the reading *kälnsāte*: *(śā)kki kaccāre po iprer kälnsāte* "the Śākyas rejoiced, and the whole heaven resounded". The same context is possible for 617 a 4 if //// *rmem* is correctly restored by TochSprR(B) to *(ipre)rmem* (Couvreur himself admitted that the context here does not speak in favor of *kälts-* 'oppress').

KAUSATIVUM III 'tosen (vom Wind)', 'howl, roar (of the wind)' (itr) (a/-/-)

        Prs IXa (a) —;-,-, *kälnaskem* (sic) Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

kälnaskem is apparently intransitive; it is attested in PK AS 7M b 4 (+ NS 122a + NS 261 + NS 262): • *karsna(m) kälnaskem* (unpublished, reading according

to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.) "(the winds) cut off, [and] howl." Intransitive valency tallies with the fact that the form does not have the initial accent typical of a Kausativum I, II, or IV.

= *ᴬkäln-* 'tönen, hallen', 'resound' (itr) (a+/-/-)

       Prs I (a+) -,-, *kälnaṣ* (sic);-,-, *kälniñc* Imp -,-, *kälñā;*—
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *kälnmāṃ*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

TA *kälnaṣ* in A 318 b 1 is rather a misspelling for Prs I **kälnäṣ* than an attestation of Prs III, thus Hilmarsson, 1996, 64 (note that /nä/ is often written ⟨nä⟩ in TA and not with the fremdzeichen ⟨na⟩, so that such a misspelling is indeed likely). The Imp TA *käl(ñā)* in A 312 a 2 (hesitantly restored in TG, 431) is a certain restoration; see Thomas, 1972, 455 with fn. 5. An *m*-Part TA *käl(nm)āṃ* is also to be restored in A 193 b 3, according to Thomas, 1958a, 142 (there is almost nothing left of the sign beneath *l*).

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'ertönen lassen', 'let resound' (tr) (a/a/a)

       Prs VIII (a) -,-, *kälnäṣṣ-äṃ;*— Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
       Sub IX (a) —;-,-, *kälnāseñc* Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt II (a) —;-,-, *kakälnār*
       PPt —
       Ipv —

Eᴛʏᴍ. As per Schmidt, 1992, 112; 1997c, 545 and Hackstein, 1995, 321f. from the nasal present of PIE **√ḱleu̯* 'hear': PIE **ḱl̥nu-* → pre-PT **klu-nu-* > PT **klänä-*, which explains the preservation of the cluster *-ln-* (not *-ll-*); see also Adams, DoT, 171.

kälp⁽ᵃ⁾- 'erlangen', 'obtain' (tr) (x/a/a)

       Prs IXa (x) *kälpāskau, kälpāst, kälpāṣṣäṃ; kälwāskem, kälwāścer,*
            kälpāskeṃ | -,-, *kälpāstär;-,-, kälpāskeṃtär*
            Imp -, *kälpāṣṣit, kälpāṣṣi;-,-, kälpāṣyeṃ*
            nt-Part *kälwāṣṣeñcai*
            m-Part *kälpāskemane*
            Ger I *kälpāṣle* Abstr I —
       Sub VI (a) *kallau, källāt, kallaṃ; källām,-, kallaṃ*
           Opt *källoym,-, kalloy;-,-, källoyeṃ/ källoṃ*

     Ger II *källälle* Abstr II *källälñe* Priv —
     Inf *källätsi*
    Pt I (a) *kälpāwa, kälpāsta, kalpa; kälpām,-, kälpāre/kälpār*
    PPt *kälpau/kälpowä* (MQ) | *kälpoṣ*
    Ipv —

The 2.sg. Prs *kälpāst* is attested in KVāc A b 5 (see Schmidt, 1986, 32), the 1.pl. Prs *kälwāskem* in G-Qm 1, 2 (see Pinault, 1987, 170), and the 2.pl. Prs *kälwāścer* on a wooden tablet from the Paris collection (according to Couvreur, 1954, 91 without further ref.). The *nt*-Part *kälwāṣṣeñcai* is a gloss on Skt. *prāpiṇam* 'who obtains' in SHT 7, 1739 (see also Schmidt, 1990, 475). Instead of a 1.sg. Opt variant *(källo)m* one has to read *(källo)[ᵢ]m* in 229 a 4; cf. Peyrot, 2008, 144, fn. 241. The Abstr *källälñe* is also attested in SHT 7, 1708 (reading: K. T. Schmidt) and in PK NS 53 a 3 (see Pinault, 1988, 100). Furthermore, there is the Priv *eṅkälpatte* found in K 6 (= PK AS 7F) b 6 and in THT 3597 a 1 (MQ) attesting to a former Sub V stem (as still shown in TA), cf. Hilmarsson, 1994, 74f. The Pt *kälwiya* quoted by Couvreur, 1954, 87 without ref. is attested in PK Cp 37, 50 (G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), but pace the manuals (TEB II, 183), the form is not to be analyzed as a Pt VII from this root, but belongs rather to *kälyp-* 'steal'; see Winter, 2001, 131 = 2005, 520 and s.v. *kälyp-*. The middle Pt *kälpāte* listed by TEB II, 183 is based on a restoration by Thomas, 1957, 124 with fn. 5 in H 149.add 12 a 2 (thus also Broomhead I, 97 and 103): *[s](u ṅke) alyek reki weṃtsi mā kä(lpāte)* "The latter did not manage however to say a single word". However, we cannot exclude an active 3.sg. with enclitic pronoun *kä(lpā-ne)*. For the 3.pl. variant *kälpār*, see chap. Pt I 7.2.1. (additional attestations of the regular 3.pl. *kälpāre* are also to be found in THT 1354 frg. c a 3, THT 1354 frg. e b 1, and THT 1551 b 4). There are some colloquial forms showing *p > w*; see most recently Peyrot, 2008, 88.

Kausativum IV 'erlangen lassen, überlassen, anvertrauen', 'cause to obtain, bestow upon' (tr) (a/-/-)
    Prs IXb (a) *kalpäskau,-, kalpäṣṣäṃ;* — Imp —
      nt-Part —
      m-Part —
      Ger I *kalpäṣṣälle* Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
      Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

kalpäṣṣäṃ in the non-MQ texts 88 b 2 and H add.149 62 a 3 (Couvreur, 1966, 165) prove initial accent. The Ger I *kalpäṣṣälle* is attested in KVāc 22 a 5 (see Schmidt, 1986, 55).

 = ᴬ*kälp⁽ä⁾-* 'erlangen', 'obtain' (tr) (m/m/m)
    Prs VI (m) *kälpnāmar, kälpnātār, kälpnātär; kälpnāmtär,-, kälpnāntär*
      Imp -,-, *śālpat;* —

nt-Part —
m-Part *kälpnāmāṃ*
Ger I *kälpnāl* Abstr I —
Inf *kälpnātsi*
Sub V (m) *kälpāmār, kälpātār, kälpātär; kälpāmtär, kälpācär,-*
     Opt *kälpimār, kälpitār, kälpitär; kälpimtär,-, kälpintär*
     Ger II *kälpāl* Abstr II *kälpālune*
Pt I (m) *kälpe, kälpāte, kälpāt; kälpāmät, kälpāc, kälpānt*
PPt *kälpo*
Ipv —

A 2.sg. Sub TA *kälpātär* is attested in PK NS 1 a 1 (unpubl., reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; already listed by Couvreur, 1956, 98 without ref.).
KAUSATIVUM IV 'erlangen lassen, überlassen', 'cause to obtain, bestow upon'
(tr) (a/-/a)
Prs VIII (a) -, *kälpäṣt,-*; — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt II (a) -,-, *kakälypā-ṃ*; —
PPt —
Ipv —

SEM. The TA grundverb is medium tantum, whereas the TB grundverb is mostly active, but there is no noticeable semantic difference. The semantics of the passive forms in both languages can overlap with that of the verbum substantivum; see Schmidt, 1974, 214ff. and 242f. ETYM. Uncertain, cf. the discussion by Adams, DoT, 172, who prefers a connection with PIE *√klep '± lay hand to'.

kälm- '± befähigen', '± enable, allow' (tr) (a/a/-)
Prs IXa (a) -,-, *kälmaṣṣäṃ-ne*; — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub I/II (a) -,-, *śilmaṃ-ne*; — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The manuals analyze *kalma* in 82 b 5 as a preterit and *śilmaṃ-ne* in 331 b 3 as a subjunctive from this root (WTG, 235; TEB II, 183). According to Winter, 1961, 95 = 1984, 166f. = 2005, 34, *kalma* is rather a noun, and according to Winter, 2001, 131 = 2005, 520 ad 173, *śilmaṃ-ne* does not belong to this root at

all, but he does not give any reason for the latter assumption. The present *kälmaṣṣäṃ-ne* is attested in the Abhidharma text 591 a 5: //// *(per)ne=<a>rhanteññe kṣayajñāṃmpa ṣe lkāsi ram no kälmaṣṣäṃ-ne pyutkäske(ṃ)-ne krentauwn(a)*. The following translations have been proposed so far: WTG, 235 'bewilligen', followed by Adams, DoT, 173 'permit, allow, accord': "this one with extinction-knowledge permits him to see, as it were, Arhat-worth and virtues manifest themselves in him", alternatively "this one permits him to see, as it were, Arhat-worth together with extinction-knowledge and virtues manifest themselves in him". Couvreur's treatment (1954, 83) leaves the present form unexplained. Thomas, 1954, 730 translates: "Er erlaubt ihm gleichsam, die Arhatwürde zusammen mit *kṣayajñāna* zu sehen". Winter, 1961, 95 = 1984, 166f. = 2005, 34 (who connects TB *kälymiye* 'direction') translates: "'to direct' or 'aus- oder wegschicken'". The passage 591 a 3f. hence should, in my opinion, be interpreted: "Nine spheres can be distinguished [i.e. in *kāmadhātu*, the world of lust, cf. Sieg/Siegling's reference to Abhidh-k VI, 33]; likewise, the irreversible-path-of-salvation is divided into nine parts; as we have said before, to split this [= the ninth, i.e., highest sphere] Bhavāgra [it is] caused by the Vajropamasamādhi [= meditation-similar-to-a-diamond] [this leads inevitably to the *kṣayajñāna*, i.e., to the knowledge-of-the-annihilation (of the Kleśas), which then leads to Arhatship; see Abhid-k VI, 45] {...} The Arhatship together with the knowledge of the annihilation (of the Kleśas) [= *kṣayajñāna*] as it were, enables him [i.e., the Arhat] to see, the virtues come to him". *lkātsi* can only reasonably refer to *dṛṣṭi* 'insight' of an *aśaikṣa* (One-who-is-perfected), cf. Abhidh-k VI, 50b-c, and see the commentary by Pruden, 1990, fn. 305, p. 1069: "The *dṛṣṭi* of the Aśaikṣas: to see things as they really are, to know the general characteristics (*sāmāyalakṣaṇa*) of the *dharmas*".

As for the passage 331 b 3f., Thomas, 1954, 22 translates: "wenn er [näml. der dānapati] nicht in dieser Weise gesprochen haben sollte, wenn er ihn {scil. den Mönch} nicht unter Ankündigung eines zweiten Tages entläßt [mit den Worten:] „Bereit haben wir uns gemacht" oder „nicht" [so] darf nicht hingegangen werden" (similarly Schmidt, 1974, 294). TEB I, 189, § 324 translates: "(wenn) er (der dānapati) in dieser Weise nicht gesprochen haben sollte (und) ihm nicht durch Angabe eines zweiten Tages die Erlaubnis gibt, ... (so) darf er (der Mönch) nicht gehen". The rule refers to the "repeated invitation" in Pāt 74, and hence a meaning "if he does not allow him/enable him (a second day)" makes sense. Finally, isolated • *śalma* //// in 498 b 7 and *kälma* //// in IOL Toch 289 a 4 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.) are completely unclear. ETYM. A (former present) stem PT *k'älm(')ä- as if from pre-PT *kelm-(e-) (as seemingly presupposed by *śilmaṃ-ne*) looks very odd; maybe we have to do with a denominative present of the Greek θέρμω type.

kä̀l(t)s- 'antreiben (Vieh)', 'goad' (tr) (m/-/-)
        Prs II/VIII (m) -,-, *kalṣtär-me* (Š);-,-, *kältsentär* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —

                     Ger I — Abstr I —
          Sub — Opt —
                     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                     Inf —
          Pt —
          PPt —
          Ipv —

SEM./ETYM. For the root semantics and the difference between *käl(t)s-* and *käl(t)s^a-*, see Hilmarsson, 1996, 68. According to Hilmarsson, the root means rather 'goad' than 'bedrohen' (which is the meaning given in the manuals). The *-t-* is epenthetic. On the etymology see most recently Seržant, 2008, 67f. (from PIE *√kelh₁).

käl(t)s^a- '(aus)pressen, (be)drücken', 'pour, (op)press' (tr) (-/a/m)
          Prs VI — Imp —
                     nt-Part —
                     m-Part —
                     Ger I *kälsnāle* Abstr I —
          Sub V (a) -, *klātsāt* (Š, sic),-; — Opt —
                     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                     Inf —
          Pt I (m) -,-, *kältsāte;-,-, kältsānte*
          PPt *kältsau| kältsoṣ* (MQ)
          Ipv —

Instead of a 3.sg. Pt *kältsāte* of this root, one has to read *kälnsāte* in H 149.69 b 3 (pace Hilmarsson, 1996, 67; cf. now Peyrot, 2007, s.v.) and also in 617 a 4 (see *käln-* 'resound'), whereas an isolated form *kältsāte* can be read in THT 1537 frg. a a 2 (MQ) (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). The obl. PPt *kältsoṣ* is attested in 362 b 8.

= *^{A}käl(t)s^a-* 'bedrücken', 'oppress' (tr) (-/m/-)
          Prs — Imp —
                     nt-Part —
                     m-Part —
                     Ger I — Abstr I —
                     Inf —
          Sub V (m) -,-, *kältsātär;—* Opt —
                     Ger II — Abstr II —
          Pt I in
          PPt *kältso*
          Ipv —

A TA *(kä)ltsnāträ-ṃ* •, i.e., an equivalent of the TB Prs VI is probably to be restored in the fragmentary passage THT 1151 b 1, because this root is the only known one in TA that shows root-final *-lts-*; the Sub *kältsātä(r)* is attested without context in the small fragment THT 2441 a 2, see Carling, DThTA, s.v.

Kausativum IV '(zusammen)pressen lassen', 'let be pressed (together)'
       (tr) (-/-/a)
       Prs — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
           Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt II (a) -,-, *kakältsā-ṃ*; —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

Sem./Etym. For the root semantics and the difference between *käl(t)s-* and *käl(t)sᵃ-*, I follow Hilmarsson, 1996, 67f. Cf. also Couvreur, 1956, 68f., who translates the TA root as "etwa 'durchdringen, treffen, ziehen' oder 'lähmen' (= B *kälts-* 'bedrohen')" (note, however, that the latter root means 'goad', cf. Hilmarsson, l.c., and see above). The kausativum can be used in the special sense of 'make one's veins gush', cf. Hilmarsson, 1996, 67 for A 77 b 2: *(puk marmas) kakältsā-ṃ* "it made (all) her (veins) gush' (and also for A 75 a 3). A different, more basic sense is found with TA *kakältsā-ṃ* in A 177 a 3: *(ṣä)lyp sepalyo kakältsā-ṃ* "he let oil be pressed with ointment".

kälsk̂ᵃ- 'verschwinden, untergehen', 'disappear, set' (?) (—)
       Prs — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub V — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II *kälskālñe/ kläskālyñe* Priv —
           Inf —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

kälskālñe is attested two times as the equivalent of Skt. *astaṃ* 'disappearance'; see Thomas, 1974, 102f. (Thomas' signature "TX 7" is now = THT 1333). The semantics are also supported by the compound member *°kläsko* in Ot. 19.1, 4 *koṃ-kläskomeṃ* 'from the west'; see K. T. Schmidt, apud Winter, 1988, 789 = 2005, 343, fn. 2; Pinault, 1998a, 364f. Etym. According to Adams, DoT, 223, s.v. *kläskālyñe*, we are dealing with a PIE *-sk̂e/o- present *k̂li-sk̂e/o- from PIE *√k̂lei̯ 'sich anlehnen' (²LIV, 332), also continued in *käly-* 'stand'.

käly- 'stehen, sich befinden', 'stand, be situated' (itr) (m+/-/-)
       Prs II+III (m+) -,-, *kaltär*;-,-, *klyentär* Imp -,-, *kälyitär*; —
           nt-Part *klyeñca*
           m-Part *klyemane*
           Ger I *klyelle* Abstr I —

Sub — Opt —
  Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
  Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

A 1.sg. Prs *klyemar* is only listed in TEB I, 198, § 355,1 without ref. The root *stäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'stand' provides the suppletive subjunctive, preterit, PPt, imperative, and kausativum forms. Prs III Ger *klyelle* is now also attested in THT 1374 frg. z b 3; cf. also the *mo*-adj. *klyemo*.

= ᴬ*käly-* 'stehen, sich befinden', 'stand, be situated' (itr) (m+/-/-)
  Prs II (m+) *kälymār,-, kälytär;-,-, klyantär* Imp -,-, *klyāt;-,-, klyānt*
   nt-Part *klyant*
   m-Part *kälymāṃ*
   Ger I — Abstr I —
   Inf *kälytsi*
  Sub — Opt —
   Ger II — Abstr II —
  Pt —
  PPt —
  Ipv —

ᴬ*ṣtäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'stand' provides the suppletive subjunctive, preterit, PPt, imperative, and kausativum forms. The Opt TA *kälyitär* listed in TG, 432 for A 3 a 3 has to be corrected to TA *kälpitär* (see TG, "Nachträge", 487, and Sieg, Übers. I, 6, fn. 2), whereas TA *klyintär* in A 400 b 3 listed by TG, l.c., belongs to TA *kli-n-* 'be obliged to' (TA *träṅktsi klyintär* "are to say"). ETYM. PIE *√k̂lei̯* 'sich anlehnen' (²LIV, 332f. with ref.). Non-finite TB *klye-* is easily explained as reflex of pre-PT *klei̯-e- > PT *kl'æ-*. As for the finite forms, I fail to see how they could derive from any originally thematic formation (as was claimed by Hilmarsson, 1996, 69f.; Ringe, 2000, 130 with fn. 28; and also Adams, 1988a, 73 and DoT, 175, who, however, preferred to set up as proto-form a "PIE *kl̥h₁-ye/o-*" from "PIE *kel(h₁)-* 'raise up'). I suggest they all go back to a pre-PT zero-grade present *kli-tor built on the basis of the PIE root aorist *k̂li-to via the *tēzzi* principle. PT *kl'ä-C- resulting from pre-PT *kli-C- explains all attested forms (including TA *kälymār* and TA *kälymāṃ*) directly, with the exception of 3.pl. *klyentär* = TA 3.pl. *klyantär*, which, however, can be easily taken for analogically modified outcomes of PT *kl'äntär (from pre-PT *kli-ntor with analogical syllabification; pre-PT *kl̥i̯-V- is maybe still reflected in the Imp *kälyitär*).

kälyp- 'stehlen', 'steal' (tr) (-/a/a)
  Prs IXa in *kälpaṣṣuki* Imp —
   nt-Part —
   m-Part —
   Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub IV (a) — Opt -,-, *kalypi; kälypiyem,-, kälypīyeṃ*

Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
Inf *kälypītsi*
Pt VII (a) *kälypiyawa/kälypawa* (sic),-, *kälwiya;* —
PPt *kekalypoṣ*
Ipv —

The *uki*-noun *kälpaṣṣuki* that is derived from a Prs IXa belongs to this root and not to *kälp⁽ä⁾*- 'obtain'; see Winter, 1961, 93f. = 1984, 165f. = 2005, 32f. and Schaefer, 1997, 168ff. The 1.sg. Pt *kälypawa* (sic, no doubt for **kälypyawa*) is attested in PK AS 14A.1 a 5, as per Couvreur, 1954, 86 pace WTG, 236; the 3.sg. Pt *kälwiya* in the monastery record PK Cp 37, 50 (reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), cf. Winter, 1961, 92 = 2005, 31 with ref. Winter, 1990, 376 = 2005, 398 further lists a 1.sg. Pt *kälypīyawa*, which may come from THT 1250 b 1: *[m]ā ñiś int(e) lānte waipeccenta* <u>*k*</u>*alypiy(a)w(a)* (sic) "when I did not steal the possessions of the king". ETYM. PIE *√klep '(heimlich) stehlen, verbergen' (²LIV, 363f.); see Hackstein, 1995, 216f. in detail and Adams, DoT, 175f.

käs- act. 'löschen', 'quench, extinguish', mid. 'erlöschen', 'come to extinction'
(tr/itr) (x/m/x)
Prs II (x) (tr/itr) -,-, *keṣäṃ;* — | -,-, *keṣtär;*-,-, *kesentär* Imp —
    nt-Part *keṣṣeñca* (MQ, sic)
    m-Part *kesemane*
    Ger I *keṣäle* (MQ) Abstr I —
Sub I (tr) — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II —
    Inf *kastsi*
Sub III (m) (itr) *ksemar,-,-;-,-, ksentär* Opt —
    Ger II *kselle* Abstr II *kselñe* Priv —
    Inf *ksetsi*
Pt III (x) (tr/itr) -, *kesasta, kessa;* — | —;-,-, *kessante*
PPt *kekesu| kekesoṣ*
Ipv —

The Prs is a former Prs VIII **gʷes-se/o-*, as per Jasanoff, most recently, 2008, 159; nevertheless, it is quite unlikely that original **-ss-* is still reflected in the nt-Part *keṣṣeñca* in the MQ text 295 a 9 (note that this text already shows many informal-style and hypercorrect forms). The 3.sg. Sub III *ksetär* in TEB I, 226, § 409,2 is probably only reconstructed. An Inf *kṣ[e]ts[i]* said to be attested in H 149.314 b 5 and analyzed in WTG, 236 as infinitive variant from this root, does not belong here; see the discussion s.v. *auks-* 'grow'. The 3.sg. Pt *kessa* is attested in 563 b 7.

KAUSATIVUM IV 'zum Erlöschen bringen', 'let come to extinction' (tr) (a/-/-)
Prs IXb (a) -,-, *kasäṣṣäṃ;* — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                        Inf —
          Pt —
          PPt —
          Ipv —

The form is attested with certainty in THT 1359 b 2: //// *(lä)[k](͜u)tsauwña mā*
kaṣaṣṣaṃ (s)umer-ṣlesa (differently Tamai, 2007a, s.v.) "does not let come to
extinction the radiant shine; (?) over Mount Sumeru ...".
= ^A*käs-* 'erlöschen', 'come to extinction' (itr) (—)

          Prs — Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
                    Inf —
          Sub III — Opt —
                     Ger II — Abstr II *ksalune*
          Pt 0/III in
          PPt *kaksu*
          Ipv —

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ IV 'löschen', 'let come to extinction' (tr) (-/-/m)

          Prs — Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
                    Inf —
          Sub — Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II —
          Pt II (m) —;-,-, *kaksānt*
          PPt —
          Ipv —

Hilmarsson, 1996, 103 set up a special root ²*käs-* with the meaning 'pour
water' for TA *kaksānt* in A 314 b 2: //// *tskānt puk ksāc kaksānt.* However,
the fragmentary passage does not become much clearer by his translation
"they were pulled quite to the irrigation [and] they were watered(?)" (cf. the
translation of the whole text by Sieg, Übers. II, 30, who precisely leaves TA
kaksānt untranslated). In addition, Hilmarsson's interpretation of the
correlated TA *ksāc* as 'watering, irrigation' (1996, 101f.) is highly unlikely. The
latter, also otherwise attested form is now taken as an adverb meaning 'close
by (?)' by Carling, DThTA, s.v. *ksāc*: "they [i.e., the rays (or flames?)] pulled
out (?) [and] made everything extinguish nearby (because of their
brightness)". Instead of a present TA *käṣt* one has to restore to *sāvasa(ṃ)*
ñ(a)käṣt in A 247 a 1, according to Schmidt, 1983, 130: "Du hast (die Finsternis
der Unwissenheit) mitsamt den Vasanas vernichtet", cf. also Hackstein, 1995,
85f. with fn. 139 (Couvreur, 1956, 75, s.v. *sāvasañ*, already had objections to a
reading TA *käṣt*, but Schmidt's restoration is superior to Couvreur's; see also
s.v. *närk-* 'keep away'). The Inf TA *kässi* gained from A 311 b 6 is also a ghost
form; see Hackstein, 1992, 144, fn. 22. Whether one can furthermore gain a

3.pl. Prs *kseñc* from *[c]riskeñc* in an unidentifiable Berlin fragment is highly uncertain.

SEM. Active forms are transitive, middle forms are intransitive. *kselñe*/TA *ksalune* means 'Nirvāṇa' and the PPt *kekesu* 'having come to extinction' and 'extinguished', similarly TA *kaksu* 'having come to extinction'; it often translates Skt. *śānta-* (Thomas, 1969, 298 with fn. 40 and 41; Schmidt, 1983, 128f.). In TA, all clear forms have the meaning 'reach Nirvāṇa'. ETYM. PIE *√gʷes 'extinguish, go out'; see Jasanoff, 2008, 155ff.

ᴬkäs- 'pour water' → *ᴬkäs-* 'come to extinction'

[*ᴬkäs-* 'be bright, shine': instead of TA *käsont*, for which Hilmarsson, 1996,
        103f. set up a special root *ᴬkäs-* 'be bright, shine', one rather has to
        emend to TA *kä(r)sont* from *ᴬkärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'know' on the evidence of the
        Sanskrit parallel version; see Saito, 2006, 451.]

käsk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'zerstreuen, zerschmettern', 'scatter' (tr) (x/x/m)
        Prs XII (x) -,-, *käskaṃ;* — | -,-, *käskäntär* (MQ); —
                Imp -,-, *käskaññītär-ne;* —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V (x) -, *kāskat,-;* — | -,-, *käskātär;* — Opt -,-, *käskoytar* (sic); —
                Ger II — Abstr II *käskälläññe* Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I (m) —;-,-, *käskānte*
        PPt *käskau/käsko* ꭓᵤ (MQ) | *käskoṣ*
        Ipv I (m) *pkaskar-ñ* (MQ);-

The 3.sg. Sub *kāskaṃ* in TEB I, 228, § 412,2 and the 3.sg. Pt *käskāte* listed in TEB I, 240, § 433,1 are probably only reconstructed. The Abstr *käskälläññe* is attested in PK AS 6A a 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the PPt *käskoṣ* in 264 a 3 and IOL Toch 501 frg. b a 2 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.). SEM. According to Melchert, 1978, 107f., the meaning 'zerstreuen' given by the manuals is problematic inasmuch as the verb is most often constructed with the adverb *waiptār* 'apart', so "[m]uch of the semantic load of 'scatter' is thus carried by the adverb". The basic semantics, according to Melchert, is rather 'strike'. ETYM. According to Melchert, 1978, 107f., to be derived from the PIE present stem *gʷʰn̥-sk̂e/o- from *√gʷʰen 'strike'; see also Hackstein, 1995, 200 and Adams, DoT, 178.

ku- 'gießen, spenden', 'pour, offer a libation' (tr) (a/x/a)
        Prs VIII (a) -,-, *kuṣän-ne* (MQ); — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *kuṣalle* Abstr I —

Sub I (x) *kewu*,-,-; — | -,-, *kutär*; — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *kwälñe* (sic) Priv —
        Inf —
Pt III (a) *kewwa*,-,-; —
PPt in *kuwermeṃ*
Ipv —

The 3.sg. Pt *kewwa* in H 149.171 b 5 belongs to this root (see Schmidt, 1985, 433; Adams, 1990, 72, fn. 12, and K. T. Schmidt apud Hackstein, 1995, 51), and not to *kau*- 'destroy, kill' (thus WTG, 238 and Broomhead I, 208). An Opt *kuwi* is only listed in TEB I, 223, § 402,2 without ref. (I am not sure whether one could gain such a form from THT 1543 frg. d b 3: *lalaṃṣkeṃ śaumoṃ tsa kuwi ksa ṃakte*; a bit differently Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). Hilmarsson, 1991, 81 reasonably proposes that the Abstr *[kw]älñe* stands for *kúwälñe* with initial accent (for the syncope of what seem even accented syllables in metrical passages, see fundamentally Thomas, 1979b and 1985). The alleged Abs *kuwermeṃ* in 617 b 5 has to be read *tärkuwermeṃ* (see Schmidt, 2000, 228) or *(t)[e]tärkuwermeṃ* (thus Peyrot, 2007a, 800).

KAUSATIVUM III/IV '?' (tr) (-/-/a)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt II (a) —;-,-, *kyauware*
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 3.pl. Pt *kyauwar(e)* is attested once in fragmentary context (116 frg. 12), so the exact meaning remains uncertain; maybe the form rather belongs with the root *kau*- 'destroy, kill', which would imply that with respect to the formation of a Pt II from the latter root, there existed a variation *kyauw*-/*śauw*-. *ky*- in a Pt II from *ku*- would be quite strange, since *ky*- is otherwise only met in the Pt II from *kän*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'come about', in which -*y*- evidently was a quite late addition; on the other hand, *kau*- is expected to have abhorred root-initial palatalization for a long time, since the root vowels have been PT *ǻ and *ā.

= ᴬ*ku*- 'gießen, spenden', 'pour, offer a libation' (tr) (a/-/a)
        Prs VIII (a) — Imp -,-, *kuṣā-ṃ*; —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub VII — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *kuñlune*
        Pt III (a) -,-, *śosā-ṃ*; —
        PPt —

Ipv —

Couvreur, 1956, 98 lists a 3.sg. Prs TA *kuṣ* from the six-part manuscript PK NS 1-6 without exact ref., but according to K. T. Schmidt, apud Hackstein, 1995, 51f. such a form cannot be found there. The actual state of the manuscript is so bad that a confirmation of the reading is impossible at present. TA *(k)[uñlu](ne)* 'offrande' as equivalent of Skt. *havyaṃ* is restored by Couvreur, 1959, 252 in A 359, 29 (see also Hilmarsson, 1991a, 65, fn. 7).

ETYM. PIE *√ĝʰeṷ 'gießen' (²LIV, 179); see Hackstein, 1995, 52f.; Adams, DoT, 179f.

kuk- 'call' → *kauk-* 'id.'

kuk- '± ermüden, auszehren', '± tire, exhaust' (tr) (—)
       Prs — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub IXb — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II *kukäṣälñe* (MQ) Priv —
           Inf *kūkästsi*
       Pt II in
       PPt *śeśśukoṣ*
       Ipv —

K̑uśi-ñ in S 8 b 2 is not an Opt/Imp from this root (thus WTG, 237; followed by Hilmarsson, 1996, 188; Adams, 1993b, 38f. and DoT, 180), but an adjective: *k̑usiñ(ñe)-pele rekisa* "with words in the Kuchean language" (see Pinault, 1987, 154 and Schmidt, 1999, 111). The Inf *kūkästsi* is attested in PK AS 15C a 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The PPt *śeśśukoṣ* in 82 a 1 belongs to this root, according to Winter, 1984, 213 = 2005, 270, and not to *staukk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'swell' (thus WTG, 301); for a translation ('exhausted, tired'), see Schmidt, 2001, 311. SEM. The Abstr II means something like '± sorrow'; see esp. Winter, 1984, 213 = 2005, 270, who sets up the basic meaning as "some kind of downward motion".

kut- 'entfernen, beseitigen', 'avert, eliminate' (?) (—)
       Prs II — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I *k̑ucalle* Abstr I —
       Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

Krause analyzes the hapax *kⸯcalle* in 606, 4 as Ger I of a Prs II from a root *kut-* 'abwenden (?), beseitigen (?)' (WTG, 237), and translates the passage *kkaṣṭa kⸯcalle star-ñ* as "das Unglück muß von mir abgewendet (?) werden" (WTG, 65, § 66, fn. 4). *kⸯcalle* is also attested in PK AS 13J b 3: //// *cwī yakṣantse kⸯcalle masta bhavaṃne* //// (cf. Couvreur, 1961, 103, who translates: "von diesem Yakṣa zu beseitigen (?), gingst du in die Behausung"). Pinault, 1989a, 163ff. takes *calle* in line 1 of the same text and in PK AS 16.2 a 4 as an allegro form of *kⸯcalle* 'écarter'. Hilmarsson, 1996, 206f., also analyses *kutsau-ś* in the business letter 495 a 4 as a form of an affiliated present stem *kut-s-* (Class VIII) from this root by the meaning 'to turns one's attention to', and then analyzes *kⸯcalle* as a Ger II of a respective subjunctive stem of Class II. However, the hapax *kutsau* is philologically difficult: *[cā]ne mā ai[t] (o)[t] k[u]tsau-ś nep yamaskemar* (reading according to Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 258; restoration D. Q. Adams, p.c.): "... [if] you do not give me back the *cāne*, I will *kutsau* you, I will make a *nep*". We may be dealing with two different roots *kut-* 'avert' vel sim. and *kuts-* '?'.

kutk^{g?}- 'verkörpern', 'give substance to' (tr) (-/-/a)

        Prs VII — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *kutäṅkmane*
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I (a) —; *śutkām,-,-*
        PPt *kutkoṣ*
        Ipv —

The PPt *kutkoṣäṃ* is attested in PK AS 17C a 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; already listed by Couvreur, 1954, 88 without reference; PPt *śutkau* in Adams, DoT, 183 is a typo; cf. now ²DoT, s.v.). The root has most likely A-character.

KAUSATIVUM III/IV '?' (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt II in
        PPt *śeśutkoṣ*
        Ipv —

śeśutku is only listed in TEB II, 184 without ref., the obl. PPt *śeśutkoṣ* is attested without much context in THT 1210 b 5 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.).

= *A*kutk*ᴮ?*- 'verkörpern', 'give substance to' (tr) (-/-/m)

      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt I (m) -,-, *kutkāt,*—
      PPt *kutko*
      Ipv —

The top of the akṣara ⟨tk⟩ of TA *kutkāt* in A 315 b 1 is damaged, so instead of TA *kutk[a]t* (thus TochSprR(A); TG, 433) the expected form TA *kutk(ā)t* can indeed be restored, cf. Sieg, Übers. II, 29, fn. 8.

Eтʏм. According to Melchert, 1978, 125, we are dealing with an *-sk̂e/o-present *kät-ske/o- from the PIE root *√ĝʰeu̯d 'gießen' (²LIV, 179f. without the Toch. verb; cf. Hilmarsson, 1996, 199 and Adams, DoT, 183).

*A*kum- 'come' → *käm-* 'id.'

*kur*ᴮ?- 'altern', 'age' (itr) (m/-/-)

      Prs II/III (m) —;-,-, *kwreṃntär* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —

The present *kwreṃntär* can formally be Prs II or III, but since it is intransitive (translating Skt. *jīryanti* 'they age, become aged') and also judging by the TA averbo, Prs III and a root with A-character is more likely. The manuals analyze *kuro* (sic) attested in 321 a 7 and restored in line b 1 of the same text as a PPt from this root (cf. WTG, 243), but it is not likely that the expected PPt †*kurau* was misspelled two times. I interpret *kuro* rather as an adjective, which, nevertheless, seems to have the same meaning 'feeble' as the TA PPt *kuro* in A 212 + A 216 a 7: 321 a 7 + b 1 *mā ra kuro osne ṣmalle* "feebly one shall not go into a house". In addition, Saito, 2006, 110 cites a form *k̂uroṣ* completely restored in 5 a 1 (which has to be monosyllabic because of the meter), based on the evidence of the Sanskrit parallel version.

= *A*kur⁽ᵃ⁾?- 'altern, schwächlich werden', 'age, become feeble' (itr) (—)

      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —

          Ger I — Abstr I —

          Inf —

   Sub — Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II —

   Pt I in

   PPt *kuro*

   Ipv —

ANTIGRUNDVERB/KAUSATIVUM 'alt machen, schwächlich werden lassen',

      'make aged, make become feeble' (tr) (m/-/-)

   Prs VIII (m) —;-,-, *kursaṃntär* Imp —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part —

          Ger I — Abstr I —

          Inf —

   Sub — Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II —

   Pt III in

   PPt *kakuru*

   Ipv —

ETYM. The PT root form is to be reconstructed as *kwär-/*käwr-, but further etymological connections are debated. See the discussion in Adams, DoT, 236 and Fellner, 2005, 27ff. Although a connection with PIE root *√ĝerh₂ 'age' (²LIV, 165f. without the Toch. verb) seems an obvious first choice, the *-w- then could not be easily explained. One therefore better starts with a Lindeman variant *(dʰ)gʷʰr̥-eh₂- either of a denominative to such an *eh₂*-noun as already suggested by Hilmarsson, 1991, 155, or of a respective aorist stem in suffixal *-eh₂-; *oṅkrotstse**, TA *oṅkrac* 'immortal' then will no doubt belong here as well, and the joint evidence of the verb and the noun together will clearly confirm that at least some Pts I with a zero grade of the root had started out as stems in pre-PT *-ā- (cf. chap. Pt I 7.3.4.).

*kurp*ᵃ*-* 'sich kümmern, versorgen', 'care' (?) (—)

   Prs III — Imp —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part —

          Ger I *kurpelle/kurwelye* Abstr I —

   Sub — Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

          Inf —

   Pt —

   PPt —

   Ipv —

A-character is certain. On *p* > *w*, see most recently Peyrot, 2008, 88. ETYM. Lane, 1960, 78 (followed by Hilmarsson, 1996, 204) compares Germanic forms such as OIce. *hverfa* 'turn, disappear' and sets up PIE *√ku̯erp 'turn' with a semantic development 'turn to something' → 'attend to'; cf. Adams, DoT, 184f.

²LIV, 392f., on the other hand, sets up a PIE seṭ root *√kᵘ̯erpH 'sich wenden' for the Germanic forms, from which not Toch. *kurpᵃ-*, but rather Toch. *karp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'descend' is said to be derived, with *-H- set up only because of the Toch. forms. Since *kurpᵃ-* forms a Prs III, we could also be dealing with a denominative.

kulᵃ- 'nachlassen', 'recede' (itr) (m/m/a)

        Prs III (m) -,-, *k̯uletär/kuletär;* — Imp -, *kulyitär-ś* (sic),-; —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V (m) -,-, *k̯ulātär-me;* — Opt -,-, *k̯uloytär;* —
                Ger II — Abstr II *k̯ulālñe* Priv *ekwalatte*
                Inf *k̯ulātsi*
        Pt I (a) -,-, *k̯ulā-ne;* —
        PPt *k̯uloṣ*
        Ipv —

The Abstr *k̯ulālñe* (listed in TEB II, 185 without ref.) can be found in IOL Toch 211 b 4 (see Peyrot, 2007, s.v.). The restoration by Sieg/Siegling of the Opt *k̯uloy(tär)* in 220 b 5 can now be confirmed by the parallel text THT 1539 frg. a a 4 (the THT fragment also confirms Couvreur's 1954c, 110 restoration of an object "geest"): //// *(k̯ulo)ytr̲a nete plskoṣ[ṣ]e* (sic!) //// "may my spirit not recede" (cf. Schmidt, 2006, 466). The Priv *ekwalatte* 'unrelenting, unabating' belongs to this root, according to Hilmarsson, 1991, 64ff. A PPt *k̯uloṣ* seems attested in THT 1340 frg. b b 3 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). Pace Hilmarsson, 1991, 65f., I do not think that the sequence starting with a damaged *k̯u* in the small fragment H add.149 101 b 3 can be restored to *k̯u(l)ā[n]e* (thus also Broomhead I, 303) and that hence a meaning 'turn, change' is proven, because the visible ink traces under the ⟨k̯u⟩, in my opinion, cannot belong to an ⟨l⟩ (maybe rather to an ⟨m⟩?), and the following akṣara is certainly ⟨tre⟩ and not ⟨ne⟩; see the photograph IOL Toch 219 and Peyrot, 2007, s.v.

= ᴬ**kulᵃ-** 'nachlassen', 'recede' (itr) (m/a/-)

        Prs III (m) -,-, *kulatär;* — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub V (a) — Opt -,-, *kuliṣ;* —
                Ger II — Abstr II *k̯ulālune*
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The damaged 3.sg. Opt TA *kuli(–)* in A 230 b 7 can only be restored to an active form TA *kuli(ṣ)* judging by the meter (see Sieg, 1937, 133; differently

TEB II, 95). The Abstr II *sne-k̫lāl(une)* is restored by Carling, DThTA, s.v. in THT 2097 a 1.

Eᴛʏᴍ. The PT root form is *kwäl-(/*käwl-), but further etymological connections are uncertain: see, e.g., Jasanoff, 1978, 39f. (PIE *√gu̯el(h₁) 'lie'); Hilmarsson, 1991, 64ff. (PIE *√ku̯elh₁ 'turn' following Poucha, TLT, s.v.); see also the etymological ref. in Adams, DoT, 236f., with Lubotsky, 1988, 92 (*√(s)k⁽ˡ⁾el 'cut') to be added.

kulypᵃ- 'verlangen', 'desire' (?) (—)
      Prs III — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I *kulypelle/kwälypelle* Abstr I in *kwälypelñeṣṣe*
      Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —
= ᴬ*kulypᵃ-* 'verlangen', 'desire' (tr) (m/-/-)
      Prs III (m) -,-, *kulypatär*;— Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I *kulypal* Abstr I —
           Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. Despite being a Prs III, the TA present stem seems to be transitive (see chap. Prs III/IV 26.2.1.). Eᴛʏᴍ. The root is generally connected with the Av. hapax *xrap-*, but this is not an entirely clear form itself (cf. most recently Cheung, 2006, 447: 'proportionate to, appropriate to (?)'); see the discussion in Hilmarsson, 1996, 191. The palatal *ly* presupposes "*kwlyäp-", as per Adams, DoT, 185; on such Prs III stems with root-initial palatalization see chap. Prs III/IV 26.1.4.2.

kus- → *kwäsᵃ-* 'lament'

kuts- → *kut-* 'avert, eliminate'

ᴬ*ken-* 'rufen', 'call' (tr) (x/-/-)
      Prs I + II (x) -, *kenät, kenäṣ*;-,-, *keneñc| kenmār*,-, *kentär*;-,-, *kenantär*
           Imp -,-, *keñā*;—
           nt-Part —

        m-Part —
        Ger I *kenäl* Abstr I —
        Inf *keṃtsi*
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

The present stem is basically athematic (cf. TA *kenät*, TA *kenäṣ*), the thematic
3.pl. endings in TA *keneñc* and TA *kenantär* are secondary, cf. Hilmarsson,
1996, 127 and see chap. Prs I 24.1.2. The root provides the suppletive present
stem to ᴬ*kāk^a*- 'call, invite'. ETYM. Hackstein, 2002a, 188f. proposes derivation
from a PIE root *√ĝh₃en; but see Vine, 2007, 350ff., who sets up an *o*-grade
present *Gon-e/o- from a root *√Gen.

kery- 'lachen', 'laugh' (itr) (a+/-/-)
        Prs II (a+) —;-,-, *keriyeṃ*/ *keryeṃ* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *keriyemane*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Instead of a PPt *kekeru* from this root one has to read *kekl(y)[u]tkuwa* in K 2 a
2, according to K. T. Schmidt apud Saito, 2006, 454 with fn. 65.

KAUSATIVUM I 'zum Lachen bringen', 'make laugh' (tr) (m+/-/-)
        Prs IXb (m+) -,-, *kerästär*;— Imp —
            nt-Part *keräṣṣeñca*
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

= ᴬ**kary-** 'lachen', 'laugh' (itr) (a+/a/-)
        Prs ? (a+) -,-, *kareṣ*;-,-, *karyeñc*/*kareñc* (?) Imp -,-, *karyā*;—
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *karemāṃ*
            Ger I *karel* Abstr I —
            Inf —
        Sub V (a) -,-, *karyaṣ*;— Opt —

Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The manuals set up a present stem of Class III; Hilmarsson, 1996, 135, on the other hand, analyzes TA *karyeñc* as Prs II and TA *karyaṣ*, TA *kareṣ* and TA *kareñc* as Sub V, the two latter forms are likewise analyzed as subjunctives by TG, 426 and TEB II, 89. However, Couvreur, 1956, 79 points out that both TA *kareṣ* and TA *kareñc* are more likely present than subjunctive forms, which is now confirmed at least for TA *kareṣ* 'laughs' in A 265 b 1 by the evidence of the Old Turkish parallel MaitrHami (XIII) 1 b 4 (identification by Pinault, 1999, 201; for the Old Turkish text, see Geng/Klimkeit/Laut, 1991, 285). The 3.pl. TA *karyeñc* is certainly a present form, while TA *kareñc-m* in the small fragment A 404 b 3 is without context. On the other hand, the 3.sg. TA *kary[aṣ]* in A 343 b 5 is rather subjunctive; see Sieg, Übers. II, 35, with fn. 16, followed by Schmidt, 2001, 309 (this form can be read thus with some certainty; it is true that the damaged akṣara seems open at the top, so that TochSprR(A) transliterated *[p]*, but the akṣara rendering *ṣ* in TA *enaṣlune* in line a 2 likewise displays a more open form).

SEM./ETYM. Either based on a "Schallwurzel" PIE *√ker, *√gʰer, or *√ger (as per Pinault, 1990, 178f.), or a root *√ĝer 'tönen, rufen' (according to Hackstein, 2002a, 214 — who sets up a pre-PT *ĝor-ei̯e/o- — this is the reconstruction to replace ²LIV, 161 *√ĝar 'id.'; note that Carling, DThTA, s.v. translates the related noun TA *karel* with 'laugher' and not with 'drum, tambour' as previously made), or PIE *√ĝʰer 'Gefallen finden, begehren' (²LIV, 176f., without this Toch. verb); see Jasanoff, 1978, 46; Adams, 1988a, 73; Hilmarsson, 1996, 135f.; Ringe, 2000, 123f. In any case, we seem to have to start with an *o*-grade *-ei̯e/o- present stem pre-PT *Korei̯e/o-. The allomorph PT *kær'äyæ- led to TB Prs *keriye-* and TA 3.pl. Prs *karye-*, and the allomorph PT *kær'æ- to pre-TA *kara- (whence, with analogical insertion of (*)-*y*- in front and after the stem-final pre-TA *-a-, Sub *karya-* and Prs *kare-*), as per Jasanoff, 1978, 46. Differently, Kim, 2007a, 57ff. sets up a denominative *ĝʰor-o-i̯e/o- based on a *ĝʰor-o-s 'pleasure, rejoicing'.

[A]*ko-* 'destroy, kill' → *kau-* 'id.

[A]*kot^ä-* 'split' → *kaut^ä-* 'id.'

[A]*koṣt^ä-* 'schlagen', 'hit, beat' (tr) (-/a/a)

  Prs — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
    Inf —
  Sub V (a) *koṣtam,-,-;—* Opt —
    Ger II *koṣtlaṃ* Abstr II *koṣtlune*

    Pt I (a) -,-, *koṣṭ*;-,-, *koṣtar*
    PPt *kākoṣtu*
    Ipv —

Etym. Belongs no doubt with *kau-/ ᴬko-* 'destroy, kill'; for a discussion of the *-st- see Levet, 1975, 100ff. and also Catsanicos, 1991, 64. It is rather obvious that we have to do with a denominative, and Hackstein, 2002a, 275, fn. 35 sets up the basic noun as "*$keu(h_2)d^hh_1$-to-".

kau- 'zerschlagen, töten', 'destroy, kill' (tr) (x/a/a)
    Prs VIII (x) -,-, *kauṣäṃ*;-,-, *kauseṃ* | -,-, *kauṣtär*;-, *kauṣtär*,- Imp —
        nt-Part *kauseñca*
        m-Part *kausemane*
        Ger I *kauṣalle* Abstr I —
    Sub I (a) -,-, *kowän*;— Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *kāwalyñe* (Š)/*kāwälñe* (M) Priv —
        Inf *kautsi*
    Pt III (a) *kauwa* (MQ), -, *kausa* (Š)/*kowsa* (Š); *kawam*,-, *kawar*
    PPt *kakāwu* | *kakāwas* (sic?)
    Ipv —

A 3.pl. Prs *k(ausentär)* is restored by TochSprR(B) in 590 a 4. The 1.sg. Pt *kewwa* (WTG, 238) belongs to *ku-* 'pour' (see s.v.). Kümmel, 2004, 153 analyzes the 1.pl. *kawam* as a subjunctive, but the only attested form (16 b 4) is most likely a preterit judging by the context of the story, which is also the usual interpretation by the manuals. The expected PPt nom.sg. ending is *-u* (cf. TEB I, 242, § 435,3), and such a PPt *kakāwu* is now actually attested in the small fragment THT 1272 b 3 beside *kakawu* in 203 a 3 (MQ). Oblique PPt *kakāpoṣ* in 179 b 3 is the expected oblique form (WTG, 238), although *p* for *w* is very uncommon (TEB I, 69, § 48,2 merely quotes this one example), but since we are dealing with a text from Sängim, it may simply be a hypercorrect form; however, the form may rather belong with *kāwᵃ-* 'desire'. A PPt *kakāwas* is attested in SHT 2250 b 2 as a gloss on Skt. *hatā* (nom.sg.fem.), so that it indeed does seem to mean 'hit' (see Hartmann, 1988, 58 with fn. 10); the correct TB form would have been †*kakāwuṣa. kawar* attested in H add.149 88 (= IOL Toch 214) a 4 is rather a 3.pl. Pt (M. Peyrot, p.c.) instead of an Ipv form (thus Broomhead I, 249).

Kausativum IV 'töten lassen (?)', 'make (?) kill' (tr) (-/-/a)
    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt II (a) *śauwwa/śauwa-me*,-,-;—
    PPt —
    Ipv —

Krause (WTG, 187, § 182) took the palatalized preterit forms to be Pt III forms acting as *let-* causatives: 266 b 2 *arañciṃ ceṃts ñiś śauwwa* "ließ ich ihre {...} Herzen töten"; H add.149 88 b 7 *(ñi)ś passāmai ṣañ larenäṃ • aswāre ka śauwa-me ////* "Ich häutete meinen Lieben und ließ sie noch unsanft töten" (WTG, 187, § 182). However, the causative interpretation is apparently only due to the palatal root initial, because I do not see why we cannot simply translate "I killed them", the more since in H add.149 88 b 7 the correlated verb *passāmai* 'I flayed' is a mere grundverb form. On the other hand, if both passages are indeed to be interpreted as *let-* causatives, I see no compelling reason not to analyze *śauwwa/śauwa-me* as regular causative Class II preterits; for the phonology, see Winter, 1965, 204 = 2005, 120. As a matter of fact, *ś-*would be extremely odd in a Pt III form made from this root, which had as root vowels PT *æ and ā.

= ᴬ*ko-* 'zerschlagen, töten', 'destroy, kill' (tr) (a+/a/a)

> Prs VIII (a+) *kosam,-,-;—* Imp *koṣāwā,-, koṣā;—*
>> nt-Part *koṣant*
>> m-Part *kosmāṃ*
>> Ger I *koṣlyes* Abstr I —
>> Inf *kossi*
> Sub I + II (a) -,-, *koṣ;-,-, kāweñc* Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II *kolune*
> Pt III (a) -,-, *kosā-m;—*
> PPt *kāko*
> Ipv —

Unlike TB, in TA the subjunctive stem seems to be thematic on the evidence of the 3.pl., the other forms are, strictly speaking, ambiguous; however it is precisely the 3.pl. which takes on thematic inflection most easily; see chap.s Sub I/V 18.1. and Prs I 24.1.2.; in any case, the thematic inflection is secondary. The form TA *pko* in A 380 a 2 and a 3 is either an imperative from this root (thus TG, 434), or belongs to TA *päkᵃ-* 'intend', which is the solution preferred by Couvreur, 1956, 78.

Sᴇᴍ. According to Winter, 1976a, 31 = 2005, 167 and 2001, 135 = 2005, 524 ad 368, the original root meaning is 'chop up' on the evidence of *kauṣn āya* 'chops up the bones' in S 4 b 1 and the compound TA *āy-keṣe* 'bone-chopper'. Eᴛʏᴍ. PIE *√keh₂u̯ 'schlagen, spalten' (²LIV, 345f.); see Hackstein, 1995, 54ff. in detail and Adams, DoT, 208.

kauk- 'rufen', 'call' (tr) (x/-/-)

> Prs II (x) -,-, *śauśäṃ;—* | *śaukemar,-, śauśtär;-,-, śaukentär*
>> Imp -, *śauśit-me,-;—*
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I *śauśalle* Abstr I *śośalñe*
> Sub — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
>> Inf —

Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. *śauśtra̱* is also attested in THT 1341 b 3, the 3.pl.mid. *śaukentra̱* is found in PK AS 17H a 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c., also listed in TEB I, 200, § 356,3 without ref.), and in THT 1347 a 4. *taukau-c* in H 149.26/30 b 2 and the restored form *tauko-c* in line a 6 of the same text are usually interpreted either as stem variants of *śauk-* (thus, e.g., WTG, 250), or as mere misspellings of *śauk-* (thus Schmidt, 1974, 95, fn. 2). According to Adams, DoT, 299, *taukau-c* in H 149.26/30 b 2 rather belongs to *tuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'hide', which is indeed the likelier claim, cf. Pinault, 2008, 323; as for *(t)auko-c* in H 149.26/30 a 6, since the beginning of the form is completely lost, we could restore to *(ś)auko-c* in the first place. The Ger I *śauśalle* is attested in PK AS 17 B a 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.) and probably also in THT 1253 a 5. *śauk-* provides the suppletive present stem for *kākᵃ-* 'call, invite' (see Couvreur, 1954, 82; Schmidt, 1974, 378f., fn. 3). For this reason, *ś[o]ś(alñe)* in 170 a 6 should be interpreted as Abstr I instead of Abstr II (despite the doubts by Couvreur, 1954, 86, this restoration is plausible). ᴇᴛʏᴍ. Note the noun *[k]au[k]e* '± call' in KVāc 24 b 4 (for which see Schmidt, 1986, 57, who translates "Antrag (?)" p. 94, and cf. Hilmarsson, 1996, 117); *śauk-* evidently belongs to the Prs II subclass with a PT root vowel *'æ from pre-PT *'ē; see chap. Prs II 25.2. Maybe to be derived from PIE *√k̑eu̯k 'rufen, schreien' (²LIV, 331; Adams, DoT, 180; also attested in Iran.; see Cheung, 2007, 340).

kautᵃ- 'spalten, zerschneiden', 'split, cleave' (tr) (a/x/x)
        Prs VI (a) -,-, *kautanaṃ*; — Imp —;-,-, *kautanoñ-c*
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V (x) —;-,-, *kautaṃ* | -,-, *kautatär*; — Opt -,-, *kautoy*; —
                Ger II — Abstr II *kautalñe* Priv *akautacce*
                Inf *kautatsi*
        Pt I (x) -, *kautāsta, kauta*; — | -,-, *kautāte*;-,-, *kautāṃte*
        PPt *kakautau* | *kakautaṣ*
        Ipv —

The present *kaut(a)n(aṃ)* is attested in 591 a 1, the PPt *kakautaṣ* in 358 a 5 (and in PK AS 6A; see Pinault, 1990a, 57). The Priv is now also found in the small fragment THT 1174 b 2 (MQ character): //// *(ta̱)ṅwsā akautācce* //// "with unbreakable love". The subjunctive shows persistent initial accent.
= ᴬ*kotᵃ-* 'spalten, zerschneiden', 'split, cleave' (tr) (a/-/a)
        Prs VI (a) -,-, *kotnaṣ*;-,-, *kotnec* (sic) Imp —
                nt-Part *kotnaṃt*
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —

Inf *kotnatsi*
Sub V — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II *kotlune*
Pt I (a) -,-, *kot̠;-, kotas,-*
PPt in *kākoturäṣ*
Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. The middle *kautāte* in 5 a 2 is intransitive, according to Schmidt, 1974, 137 ("Da brach die Achse des Wagens"), but passive function is more likely. Eᴛʏᴍ. The root is ultimately to be derived from PIE *√keh₂u̯ 'schlagen, spalten' (²LIV, 346), the unextended root is continued by *kau-/ᴬko-* 'destroy, kill' and was said to show a dental *dʰe/o*-extension like Lat. *cūdō* by Hackstein, 1995, 55, who seems to set up zero-grade *kh₂u-dʰe/o-, and by Kümmel (²LIV, 346, fn. 8), who prefers full-grade *keh₂u-dʰe/o-, Hilmarsson, 1996, 120f. *ko/eh₂u-d-. However, *-dʰ- > Lat. -*d*- after a preceding *-u̯- is highly problematic (cf. now also de Vaan, 2008, 149); explicitly for this reason, Hilmarsson, 1996, 120f. rather reconstructed *ke/oh₂u-d-, but one should not expect a PIE *-d- to show up as Tocharian -*t*- after a vowel or diphthong. Since the Tocharian verb actually rather seems to be a denominative (which is now evidently also the guess preferred by Hackstein, 2002, 14f., who, however, set up a "Kompositum *keu̯h₂/kou̯h₂-dʰh₁-o-"), I think there is no reason not to derive it from a nominal form with PIE *-t-, e.g., an abstract *kou̯h₂-to- or *koh₂u-to- of the νόστος type.

ᴬ*kñas-* 'kennen', 'know' (tr) (-/-/a)
    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt III (a) *kñasu, kñasäṣt̠,-;* —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

TA *kñasu* in YQ 4 a 1 is a 1.sg.act Pt III, as per Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 50ff. = Winter, 2005, 434ff. (followed by Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 271): YQ 4 a 1 + A 214 b 6 *namo buddha weñlune klyosäṃṣawā täṃ nu mā kñasu kus taṃ buddhaṃ mäskaträ* "I kept hearing that 'Reverence to the Buddha' [namo buddha] was said, but I did not know what *buddha* referred to"; for the 1.sg. active ending variant TA -*u*, see chap. Pt III 9.1.2.1. TA *kñasäṣt* in A 340 b 5 was analyzed as a preterit form independently by Hackstein, 1993a, 152ff. and Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 51 = Winter, 2005, 435; strangely enough, the form seems to be construed with a locative rather than with an obliquus, see Hackstein, l.c., with ref.; however, the most recent translation by Carling, DThTA, s.v. *käṃs-* takes the form to be transitive nevertheless: "Did you know (the butcher) in the village Vāsavagrāma?". The *m*-Part TA *knāsmāṃ*

listed sub an entry "*knās-* 'know'" in the verbal index of Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 271 is due to an abandoned reading. Etym. TA *kñas-* of course somehow belongs with TA *knā-*, etc. For the *-s-*, see Hackstein, 1993a, 153, who compares *tā-* 'put' having a Pt III stem *cas-*, and more recently Peters, 2006, 339, fn. 25; cf. also Müller, 2007, 273, fn. 994.

^A**kñā-ññ-** '± erkennen', '± recognize, acknowledge' (tr) (-/m/m)

      Prs — Imp —
              nt-Part —
              m-Part —
              Ger I — Abstr I —
              Inf —
      Sub XII (m) -,-, *kñāñtär*,— Opt —
              Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
      Pt V (m) -,-, *kñāññāt*,-,-, *kñāññānt*
      PPt *kākkñäññu*
      Ipv —

Since all finite attestation are middle forms, and since *ññ*-stems are usually inflected in the middle, one should rather read a middle TA *kñāññāt* in A 217 a 2 instead of an active form TA *kñāññā t.* Hackstein, 1993a, 154f. takes TA *kñāñtär* for an old Sub VII, and TA *kñāññāt* and TA *kñāññānt* for imperfect forms from the Prs VI stem TA **knānā-* (implicitly claiming that Sub VII *kñāñtär* with *kñ-* by "Fernassimilation" was reanalyzed as Sub XII form), because he analyzes TA *kñasäṣt* as a preterit synchronically belonging to ^A*knā-*. It is indeed possible that TA *kñāññāt* and *kñāññānt* are imperfects (the respective contexts are too fragmentary to decide the question from a syntactical point of view), and although preterits are in general more common than imperfects, precisely *ññ*-imperfects are more often attested than finite Pt V forms; see chap. Pt V 11.2. Sem. The exact meaning cannot be determined, but Hilmarsson's proposal 'recognize' (1991a, 96ff.; 1996, 161f.) goes well with the new attestation of TA *(k)ñāñtär* in YQ 11 a 3 (see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 120). Etym. Assuming that the Sub XII started out as a Sub VII would provide an elegant explanation for the absence of *y*-insertion ("palatal epenthesis"), since in contrast to TA Prs/Sub XII forms, TA Sub VII forms as a rule do not show such an insertion. Of course it is hard to see any special reason why a Sub VII form TA *kñāñtär* should have undergone such a reanalysis, but the alternative explanation by Hilmarsson, 1991a, 101, who claimed that a Sub I stem **knā-* was turned into a Sub XII stem (NB: lacking *y*-epenthesis) directly, is hardly more attractive. Note that a Sub VII stem pre-TA **knāñä-* could have replaced both a PT Sub I stem **knā-* and a PT Sub I stem ***knānä-* from pre-PT **gnō-nu-* (with a substitution of pre-PT **-na-* by pre-PT **-nu-*).

^A**knā-** 'wissen, (er)kennen', 'know, ' (tr) (a+/-/-)

      Prs VI (a+) -, *knānat*, *knānaṣ*;-,-, *knāneñc* Imp —
              nt-Part —
              m-Part *knānmāṃ*

Ger I *knānal* Abstr I —
        Inf —
Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The restoration of a 1.sg. TA *knāna(m)* in A 413 b 2 as per TG, 435 is not entirely certain. The Ger I seems attested in THT 2472 a 2: *//// artal knān(al) ////* (Carling, DThTA, s.v. *knānal*).

SEM. See Hackstein, 1993a, 150f. ETYM. From PIE *ĝn̥-n(e)-h₃-, the PIE nasal present from the root *√ĝneh₃ 'erkennen' (²LIV, 168ff.); see Hackstein, 1993a, 151 with ref., and in addition Isebaert, 1992, 290, fn. 21. This Prs VI of Tocharian A probably forms an equation with the TB Prs/Sub VI (*)nānā-, see s.v. *nān⁽ā⁾-*.

ᴬ*knäsw?-* '± herantreten (in ehrender Weise)', '± approach (in revering manner)' (itr) (—)
        Prs I/II — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *knäswmāṃ*
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The *m*-Part is attested twice, and both times it is construed with a noun denoting a person in the allative. Traditionally, the verb is therefore translated as 'herantreten' (Sieg, Übers. I, 27; Hilmarsson, 1996, 161 '± to come close to, approach, press up to'). Carling, DThTA, s.v. now rather proposes '± bow'.

krāk?- '± sich beschmutzen, verschwommen werden (?)', '± become dirty, blurred (?)' (?) (VIII/-/-)
        Prs VIII (m) -,-, *krākṣtär*;— Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The form is a hapax found in PK AS 7M b 1 (+ NS 122a + NS 261 + NS 262) (pāda 25a; Karmavibhaṅga): *sn(ai) peñyai (l)k(ā)ṣṣäṃ | krākṣträ ersna wämpasträ* (reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; | indicates caesura). M. Peyrot (p.c.) suggests a connection of the form with *krāke* 'dirt, filth'; for the passage see the discussion s.v. *wämp?-* '?', where it is argued that it may refer to poor eye sight, hence 'become blurred'. Since in all Prs VIII stems A-character gets lost, the stem character of the root remains unclear.

krāt?- '± herausfordern', '± challenge' (?) (—)

    Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
    Pt IV in
    PPt *kakrātäṣu*
    Ipv —

Hapax in 110 a 8 (M): //// *(ti)ṣyentse kakrātäṣu māṭhare* "der von Tiṣya herausgeforderte Māṭhara" (WTG, 189, § 185); see also Hilmarsson, 1996, 177f. W. Winter (p.c.) proposes '± step forward', Kaus. '± cause to step forward'.

ᴬkrārp- → ᴬ*kārp⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'descend'

krās⁽ᵃ⁾- act. 'ärgern, quälen', 'annoy, vex', mid. 'sich ärgern', 'be angry' (tr/itr) (m/-/x)

    Prs IV (m) -,-, *krosotär*; — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
    Pt I (a) -,-, *krāsa/krasā-ñ*; —
    Pt VII (m) -,-, *kraṣīyate*; —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *krosotär* is attested in PK NS 29 a 1 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c., also listed by Schmidt, 1982, 371, fn. 62 without ref.). For the Pt VII *kraṣīyate* '± was angry', see Winter, 1961, 91 = 1984, 162f. = 2005, 30.

KAUSATIVUM III act. 'quälen', 'vex', mid. 'sich ärgern', 'be angry' (tr/itr) (x/-/-)

    Prs IXa/b (x) -,-, *krāsäṣṣäṃ* (MQ); — Imp -,-, *krasäṣṣītär* (MQ); —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —

                    Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                    Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
For the correct reading of K 10 b 2, see Sieg, 1938, 46: *(cmelane mā ce)w yoko krāṣaṣṣaṃ ṣeka* (sic): "Ständig quält jenes [Wesen] (in [seinen] Geburten nicht) der Durst". For H 149.200 a 3, see Thomas, 1972, 456, fn. 4 ("machte er Vorwürfe"), and Schmidt, 1974, 168 ("ihr ward darüber verärgert"; left untranslated in Broomhead I, 211).

= ᴬ**krās-** 'ärgern', 'annoy' (tr) (—)
        Prs — Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
                    Inf —
        Sub XII — Opt —
                    Ger II *krāṣiññäl* Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
Eᴛʏᴍ. See Adams, DoT, 215 with ref., and also Schmidt, 1982, 371f., and Hilmarsson, 1991b, 145f. Evidently denominative(s) to an *o*-stem (and possibly a parallel *i*-stem; cf. chap. Pt VII 13.2.).

krämp⁽ᵃ⁾- 'gehemmt sein, gestört werden', 'be hindered, disturbed' (itr) (m/-/a)
        Prs III (m) -, *krämpetar*,-; — Imp -, *krämpitar*,-; —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V — Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II *krämpālñe* Priv —
                    Inf —
        Pt I (a) -, *krämpāsta*,-; —
        PPt *krämpoṣ*
        Ipv —
The 3.sg. Prs *krämpetär* in TEB II, 188 is most likely only reconstructed.
Aɴᴛɪɢʀᴜɴᴅᴠᴇʀʙ 'hemmen', 'disturb, hinder' (tr) (a/-/a)
        Prs VIII (a) -,-, *kramṣäṃ* (sic);-,-, *kramseṃ* (sic) Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub I/II — Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

     Inf *kramtsi* (sic)
   Pt III (a) —;-,-, *krempar*
   PPt —
   Ipv —
The 3.pl. Prs *kramseṃ* is read by Sieg, 1938, 33 in K 7 (= PK AS 7G) b 4. The
evidence for the subjunctive class is ambiguous. On the loss of *p*, see Peyrot,
2008, 68f. The Pt *krempar* is attested in PK AS 13E b 8 (see Couvreur, 1954,
87f., but pace Couvreur, one indeed has to read the expected *krempar* and not
†*krempär*, according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).
= ᴬ***krämp*ᴮ*-** 'gehemmt sein, gestört werden', 'be hindered, disturbed' (itr) (—)
   Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub V — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II *krämpālune*
   Pt I in
   PPt *krämpo*
   Ipv —
TA *krämpālune* is attested in YQ 27 a 3, TA *krämpont* in YQ 27 a 3 and b 4.
According to M. Peyrot (p.c.), one may further restore a 3.pl. Sub V TA
(k)rämpeñc in the small fragment THT 2126 b 1 and a 1.sg./pl. Prs VIII TA
krämsa(m/mäs) in the small fragment THT 2167 b 3.
Eᴛʏᴍ. As per Adams, DoT, 216.

ᴬ***kru*-** '?' (?) (—)
   Prs I/II — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf *krutsi*
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —
Attested twice without context in an unpublished fragment (as per TG, 435)
that can now be identified as THT 1135 (a 4 and b 1); cf. Carling, DThTA, s.v.

ᴬ***krop*⁽ᵃ⁾-** 'gather, assemble, congregate' → *kraup*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'id.'

***kraup*⁽ᵃ⁾-** 'sammeln', 'gather', 'assemble, congregate' (tr) (m/m/m)
   Prs (I+)II (m) -,-, *krauptär*;— Imp —;-,-, *kraupiyentär*
     nt-Part —
     m-Part *kr(·)wpemane* (MQ)

> Ger I — Abstr I —
>
> Prs VI (m) -,-, *kraupanatär/kraupnatär;*-,-, *kraupnantär* Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I *kraupanalle* Abstr I —
>
> Sub (I+)II (m) -,-, *krauptär;*-,-, *kraupentär-ne* Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
>> Inf —
>
> Sub V (m) *kraupamar,*-, *kraupatär;*-,-, *kraupantär*
>> Opt -,-, *kraupoytär;* —
>> Ger II *kraupalle* Abstr II *kraupalñe* Priv *akraupatte*
>> Inf *kraupatsi*
>
> Pt I (m) -, *kraupātai, kraupāte;*-,-, *kraupānte*
>
> PPt *kakraupau| kakraupaṣ*
>
> Ipv —

The 3.sg. *krauptär* in 33 a 6 and 3.pl. *kraupentär-ne* in K 3 a 2 are analyzed as present forms by Couvreur, 1954, 86 contra WTG, 123, § 121 fn. and 239, but syntactically the forms are subjunctives (cf. Peyrot, 2008, 150; note that Sieg, 1938, 10 wanted to restore the attested *kraupentär-ne* to a Sub V: "l[ies] *kraupantärne*"). A homonymous present stem is attested by *krauptär* in H 149.add 8 b 3 and the Imp *kraupiyentär;* note that Tocharian A has a Prs I. The restoration of a thematic *m*-Part from this root in 304 a 4 (MQ) is certain thanks to the Skt. equivalent *samudānīya;* instead of the form with *ew (kre)w[p]emane* restored by Sieg/Siegling and adopted by the manuals, one may also restore to *(krau)wpemane*, as per Peyrot, 2008, 45, fn. 30, who, however, also points out the nominal form *krewpentse* from THT 1859 a [recte b] 3 (MQ) indeed showing the old *ew*-diphthong (p. 46). A non-syncopated 3.sg.mid. Prs VI *kraupanatär* is attested in an unpublished Berlin text, according to Thomas, 1979, 166, which could be the small fragment THT 1209 a 2: //// *ne kraupana(t)[ra]* //// (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). The 1.sg. Sub *kr(au)pamar* is found in PK 6A b 1, the 3.sg. Sub *kraupatär* in PK 17D a 4 (see Couvreur, 1954, 85f. and Pinault, 1994, 128). The Abstr *kr(au)palñe* is also attested in a gloss in SHT 7, 1666 (reading: K. T. Schmidt), the Priv *akraupatte* also in IOL Toch 308 a 5 (see Peyrot, 2008a, 105). Whether we are dealing with an active form *[k](rau)pnaṃ* in H 149.add 65 b 5 (thus Broomhead II, 100; not in the edition I, 228; similarly Thomas, 1979, 166) is unclear, according to Schmidt, 1974, 27; judging by the photograph (see IOL Toch 151), lack of any trace of an ⟨au⟩ is highly suspicious, and also the vertical line of the *[k]* is much too long for a ⟨kra⟩, which also would not explain the small horizontal stroke; maybe ⟨kś⟩? The subjunctive of Class V shows persistent initial accent.

KAUSATIVUM IV 'versammeln lassen', 'let gather' (tr) (-/-/a)

> Prs — Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
>
> Sub — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

            Inf —

    Pt IV (a) -,-, *kraupäṣṣa*;-,-, *kraupäṣṣare* (S)

    PPt —

    Ipv —

The 3.sg. Pt *kraupäṣṣa* is often attested in Vinaya texts from the Paris collection, e.g., in PK AS 18A a 1 (see Thomas, 1979a, 238): *(pa)ñäkte sāṅk kraupäṣṣa* "Buddha had gathered the community"; according to Thomas, l.c., 240, "findet man in analogen Fällen dafür also das Prät. vom Grundverb (B *kraupāte*), was letzten Endes doch auf eine engere Berührung beider Ausdrücke schließen läßt", i.e., we probably have to do with a *let-* causative beside a mere transitive.

= ᴬ*krop⁽ä⁾-* 'sammeln', 'gather', 'assemble, congregate' (tr) (m/m/m)

        Prs I (m) -,-, *kroptär*;-,-, *kropäntär* Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part *kropmāṃ*

            Ger I *kroplyāṃ* Abstr I —

            Inf *kroptsi*

        Prs VI (m) — Imp -,-, *kropñāt*;-,-, *kropñānt*

            nt-Part —

            m-Part *kropnmāṃ/kropnämāṃ*

            Ger I *kropnal* Abstr I —

            Inf *kropnasi*

        Sub V (m) — Opt -,-, *kropitär*;—

            Ger II *kropal* Abstr II *kroplune*

        Pt I (m) *krope*, *kropte*, *kropat*;-,-, *kropant*

        PPt *kākropu/kākrupu*

        Ipv I (m) *päkropār*;-

The 3.pl. Prs TA *kropäntär* is attested four times in the YQ manuscript (YQ 31 a 7, a 8, b 1; YQ 35 b 7). In the glossary by Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 271 it is analyzed as a subjunctive form (with question mark); but see now Geng/Laut/Pinault, 2004, 363 and 365 for YQ 31 a 7ff.

Eᴛʏᴍ. Hilmarsson, 1996, 178f. takes the Sub V to be the older subjunctive stem; Similarly Peyrot, 2008, 150. As a matter of fact, we seem to deal with the reflex of a very rare and archaic pattern consisting of an athematic root present and a preterit derived from that present by the addition of (non-palatalizing) suffixal PT *-ā-.

klāṅkᵃ- 'fahren', 'go by wagon' (?) (-/-/a)

        Prs — Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub V — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

            Inf *klāṅkatsi*

      Pt I (a) *klaṅkāwa,-, klāṅka;-,-, klaṅkāre*
      PPt —
      Ipv —

An Inf *kl[ā]ṅkatsi* is attested according to Thomas, 1952, 50, fn. 3 (without ref.), the 3.pl. Pt *kl(a)ṅk(a)re* is found without context in IOL Toch 485 b 1 (see Peyrot, 2007, s.v.).

= *ᴬklāṅkᴵ-* '?' (?) (—)
      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub V — Opt —
            Ger II *klāṅklye* Abstr II —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —

TG, 436 lists the possible attestation of a 3.sg. Pt TA *klāṅ[k]aṃ* from an unpublished text, which can now be identified as THT 1144 a 1: //// *[ma] klāṅ[k]aṃ kr(·)mā* ////; but since the form is without context, we may also be dealing with a noun in the locative, as per TG; see also the discussion below.

SEM. The manuals translate the root with 'reiten' and 'fahren' (WTG, 239; TEB II, 188), Thomas, 1952, 50, fn. 3 even with 'satteln, reiten', but at least in Tocharian B there is, I think, no evidence for a meaning other than 'go by wagon'. The cognate noun *kleṅke* has the meaning 'vehicle' either used in the Buddhist sense of a means to arrive at knowledge (Skt. *yāna-*) or of a concrete 'wagon, cart', cf. Pinault, 1987a, 81f. (who also interprets the personal name *Kleṅka-rako* as 'Wagenlenker'). All but one verbal form in TB are without context (including *klāṅka* in 98 a 1 which is not listed in WTG; I cannot find the Inf), while for *klāṅka* in 363 a 3 we know the Sanskrit parallel version (Vītaśokāvadāna, Divy 28), as noted by TochSprR(B): *(pre)ściyaine śerītsi klāṅka* "At this time he went hunting" being the equivalent of Skt. *atha rājāśoko 'pareṇa samayena mr̥gavadhāya nirgataḥ* "Then king Aśoka at another time went out hunting" (cf. Cowell/Neil, 1886, 419). The Sanskrit version is hence unclear with respect to riding on horseback or wagon, and both types of transport are possible in theory (for kings hunting on horseback in Jātaka stories, see, e.g., the pictures collected in Krottenthaler, 1996, 190f. [from Ajanta] and 159 [from Dunhuang]). Tocharian A is more complicated. TEB II, 99 translates the cognate of *kleṅke*, i.e., TA *klaṅk* with "'Vehicle', Skt. *yāna*" similarly to the TB form, while TG, 2, § 2b and p. 436 gave 'Reittier' as meaning of both TB *kleṅke* and TA *klaṅk*. Although the TA noun is attested twelve times, I cannot find a passage where it has the metaphoric sense of 'vehicle (of knowledge)', the predominant meaning in Tocharian B; cf. also Carling, DThTA, s.v. *klaṅk* 'riding animal'. In A 73 a 3 TA *klaṅk* certainly refers to the heavenly vehicle of Indra pulled by elephants (cf. Sieg, Übers. II, 19). On the other hand, there are two passages where TA *klaṅk* seems to refer

to animals: A 266 b 8 *sākres klaṅksā lmo(ṣ)*, which has an Old Turkish parallel in MaitrHami XVI, 14 b 28-29: "bestiegen [sanfte] Reittiere" (cf. Carling, 2000, 237 with ref. to Geng/Klimkeit, 1985, 91 and 110). However, as Müller/Sieg, 1916, 404 (who likewise translated "sanfte Reittiere") pointed out, TA *sākär klaṅk* may be the equivalent of Skt. *badhrayāna-* 'splendid *yāna*', and although the Old Turkish translator understood the passage to refer to horses, I would not exclude that TA *sākär klaṅk* indeed referred rather to a chariot. The second passage in question is A 345 a 3 - b 1: *okät tmāṃ ñä(kta)ñ ṣñi ṣñi wartsyaśśäl pkänt pkänt ñäkcinäs wāmp(u)ñcäs y[u]<k>[s]ā oṅ[kä](lmā)s(ā) ñemiṣinäs kuklasaṃ lmoṣ tri-wäknā klaṅkasy(o)* • (restoration according to W. Siegling, pers. copy) "80 000 gods together with their retinue sitting on heavenly decorated horses, elephants, [and] diamond vehicles with trifold *klaṅks*". Here, the instr.pl. TA *klaṅkasyo* can reasonably only refer to carthorses (cf. also the partial translation by Carling, 2000, 45). The only TA verbal form is a Ger II in A 264 a 2: • *y ͜ukañ oṅkälmāñ w(u) klāṅklye pākräk śkaṃ p ͜ukis mäska(nträ)* (restoration according to W. Siegling, pers. copy). Thomas, 1952, 50 translates: "Pferde, Elefanten, die zwei Reittiere, werden auch jedem offenbar", but since both animals do pull wagons (at least the miraculous chariots of the gods, and this passage comes from the hell chapters of MSN), the passage can as well mean "(the) two driving animals" (note the collocations TA *yukañ klaṅkañ oṅkälmāñ* in A 22 b 6 which Sieg, Übers. I, 27 translates "Rosse, Fahrzeuge [und] Elephanten"). Thomas was apparently prompted to interpret the Ger TA *klāṅklye* by "wörtl. 'die Sattelbaren'" because of TA *klaṅk* 'Sattel' (?) (fn. 3) that he could only have gained from interpreting TA *klāṅ[k]aṃ* in THT 1144 a 1 as a locative. As was mentioned above, this form is attested in a passage too fragmentary to offer a reasonable interpretation, let alone to support such a highly speculative one. In any case, for morphological reasons the Ger II should have a basic meaning 'transport', i.e., could refer to both vehicles and mounts (just like Skt. *vāhana-*). To sum up, there is no certain evidence that either the verb or the noun could have the notion 'riding' in addition to '(going by/pulling a) wagon'. ETYM. Evidently a denominative to the noun *kleṅke*/ TA *klaṅk* as discussed above, as per Hilmarsson, 1996, 141 and Adams, DoT, 220.

*klāp*ᵃ- '± berühren, massieren; überprüfen', '± touch; investigate' (tr) (m/-/m)
    Prs II (m) -,-, *klyeptär*;-,-, *klyepentär* Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Prs VI — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I *klawwanalle* Abstr I —
    Sub V — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *klāpalñe* (MQ) Priv —
        Inf —

Pt I (m) -,-, *klawāte-ne*; —

PPt in *kaklāparmeṃ*

Ipv I (m) *päklapar* (MQ);-

The 3.sg. Prs *klyeptär* is attested in THT 1355 a 2 (see also below) and in the small fragment THT 2379 frg. o a 1 (without much context), the 3.pl. Prs *klyepentär* in PK AS 7K a 2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The Ger I *kla[wwa]nalle* is read by Carling, 2003a, 40 and 51 in Fill. Y 1 b 4f. with the translation 'pétrir', and it is connected by her with the Pt form *klawāte* with ref. to Pinault, in print. The 2.sg.mid. Ipv *päklapar* is found in THT 1565 a 1: //// *p̱aklapar*\ *ṣa[r]*\ "Touch the hand!" (or *ṣa[r]**ne* 'hands'?). SEM. *klawāte-ne* in 5 b 5 has roughly the meaning '± stroke'; Sieg/Siegling, TochSprR(B), glossary, 117 (followed by TEB II, 189) set up a special stem for that form. The non-finite forms are analyzed as formations belonging to *klāw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be called' by WTG, 240, and TEB II, 188. However, *kaklāparmeṃ* in 532 b 2 is most certainly the equivalent of Skt. *vimṛśya* 'after he had checked' (see Couvreur, 1968, 282), and so it follows for Couvreur that the form rather belongs to a root *klāp/w-* 'stroke, investigate' like *klawāte*, since Skt. *vi √mṛś* has precisely the same range of meaning 'touch, stroke' and 'investigate'. *klāpalñ(e)* in 156 a 2 is without much context and unclear (cf. Couvreur, l.c., fn. 24); the same is true for a new attestation in THT 1354 frg. b a 4. The equation of the present *klyeptär* with Skt. *saṃmṛśati* made in VW I, 223 comes from the Udānavarga text TX 4 (now THT 1355) a 2 (MQ), where the Toch. form is the direct translation of BHS *saṃmṛśati* (Skt. *saṃspṛśati*) 'touches'; see Thomas, 1974, 91f. TA *klāpac* rather belongs to *klāw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be called'. ETYM. The forms listed here clearly belong to one single root denoting 'touch' that can reasonably be derived from PIE *√klep '(heimlich) stehlen, verbergen' (²LIV, 363), as per Adams, 1989, 242f., and DoT, 227 (who sets up *klep-* '± touch'). *klyeptär* (which must be a Prs II — pre-PT *klēpä- should have resulted in PT *kl'opu- > *kl'opä-) looks like the continuant of a PIE Narten stem *klēp- (cf. Adams, 1989, 242, fn. 2, and for the Narten behavior of this root now esp. Pike, 2009, 205ff.; see also chap. Prs II 25.2.) — the Pt I, however, must have a different root vowel. The sound change *p > w* belongs to the informal/eastern variety of TB (see most recently Peyrot, 2008, 88ff.).

klāyᵃ- 'fallen', 'fall' (itr) (m/a/x)

   Prs IV (m) *kloyomar*,-, *kloyotär*;-,-, *kloyontär* Imp —

      nt-Part —

      m-Part *kloyomane*

      Ger I — Abstr I —

   Sub V (a) -, *klāyat*, *klāyaṃ*;-,-, *klāyaṃ*

      Opt -,-, *klāyoy*;-,-, *klāyoyeṃ*/*klāyo-ñ*

      Ger II — Abstr II *klāyalñe* Priv —

      Inf —

   Pt I (x) *klayāwa*,-, *klāya*;-,-, *klayāre* | —;-,-, *klayānte*

   PPt *kaklāyau* | *kaklāyaṣ*

Ipv —

A 1.sg. Prs *kloyomar* is also attested in THT 1249 a 3. Thomas restores a middle Sub *klāyatä(r)* in H 149.add 63/59 a 5 (1986, 133), but Broomhead I, 148 and II, 95, WTG, 239, and Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 144 correctly read here a 2.sg.act. *klāyaṭ*. Broomhead furthermore restores a present *klo[y]e(nträ)* in H 149.313 a 4 (Broomhead I, 220), but the unexpected *e*-vocalism makes this restoration highly unlikely. A 3.sg. Opt *klāyoy* seems attested in the fragment THT 1321 b 1 without much context, and the 3.pl. Opt variant *klāyo-ñ* in THT 2243 a 2 (see Peyrot, 2008, 143). The subjunctive shows persistent initial accent. The 3.pl. Pt *klayānte* is found in PK Cp 37, 54 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

= *ᴬklāwꜣ-* 'fallen', 'fall' (itr) (m/a/a)

         Prs IV (m) -,-, *klawatär*;-,-, *klawantär* Imp III —;-,-, *klawär*

                 nt-Part —

                 m-Part —

                 Ger I — Abstr I —

                 Inf —

         Sub V (a) -,-, *klāṣ-äṃ*;— Opt -,-, *klāwiṣ*;—

                 Ger II — Abstr II *klālune*

         Pt I (a) -,-, *klā*;-,-, *klār*

         PPt *kāklo*

         Ipv —

All middle present forms of the shape TA *klawatär* and TA *klawantär* with clear context belong to this root, and not to *klāw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be called', as does the Opt TA *klāwiṣ*; see Schmidt, 1974, 38, and 53, fn. 3 (contra TG, 436); on the formation of the optative form, see Hilmarsson, 1994, 103ff. The 3.sg. Sub forms TA *klāṣ-äṃ* in A 146 b 4 and TA *klāṣ-äm* in A 395 b 2 also rather belong here and not to *ᴬkälꜣ-* 'lead'; see above. The 3.pl.act. *klawrä* in YQ 5 a 6 is intransitive and functions as an imperfect to be judged by the correlated imperfect form TA *ypār* (cf. Carling, DThTA, s.v. 1. *klāwa-*). On the form see chap. Imp 15.3.3.

ETYM. Hilmarsson, 1996, 147f. (with ref.) claims the root is PIE *√kleu̯h₂* (²LIV, 365 *√kleu̯H 'wohin geraten', without the Toch. verb), setting up *kl̥h₂u̯-eh₁- > *klāw'æ- > *klāw'ā-. The different root finals TB -*w* and TA -*y* are actually best explained by setting up PT *klāw'ā- with a palatal *w' that turned into TB *y* by regular sound change; for TA *klā-* < *klāw'ā-, see Winter, 1965a, 203f. = 1984, 169f. = 2005, 128f. PT *klāw'ā- could ultimately come from pre-PT *klou̯Pi̯ā-, cf. *√kleu̯b 'stolpern, hüpfen' (²LIV, 364).

ᴬklāwꜣ- 'fall' → *klāyꜣ-* 'id.'

klāw⁽ᵃ⁾- 'genannt werden, heißen', 'be called, named' (itr) (m/-/a)

         Prs IV (m) -,-, *klowotär*;-,-, *klyowontär* Imp —

                 nt-Part —

                 m-Part —

          Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf —
Pt I (x) -,-, *klāwa*; —
PPt *kaklāwau*| *kaklāwaṣ*
Ipv —

Palatal stem-initial *kly* is only confirmed for the 3.pl. Prs in K 2 a 3 (= PK AS 7B, reading verified by G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; MQ character); on the other hand, non-palatalized stem-initial *kl* is certain for 3.sg. *klowotră* in 615 b 3 (MQ) and in IOL Toch 380 a 2 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.); the other present forms are uncertain with respect to the initial: the initial akṣara of the 3.sg. *k[l]owotär* in 158 b 5 (MQ) is damaged, and can hence be read either *k[l](y)owotär* (thus TochSprR(B)), or *k[l]owotär*; the 3.pl. in PK NS 53 a 4 (see Pinault, 1988, 100) is likewise initially damaged and unclear. The Abstr *klāpalñe* listed under this root by WTG, 240 is without context, and since it has -*p*- it either has to be a hypercorrect form of this root or belongs to *klāp^a*- 'touch' (which is more likely, because it comes from an MQ text). The form *klāwi* in H 149.39 a 3 is not an optative of this stem (thus WTG), but a noun; see Couvreur, 1954, 85, which is now confirmed by a second attestation in PK AS 12C a 5 and by the derived adjective *klāwissu* in PK AS 12C a 6 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). Pinault, 1988a, 188 further restores a 3.sg.mid. Pt *(klaw)[ā](t)e* in PK NS 34 a 3 ("il fut nommé"); middle Pt I forms beside Prs IV may be unusual, but are not unattested. The PPt *kaklāwaṣ* is attested in the bilingual text SHT 9, 2348 (reading: K. T. Schmidt).

KAUSATIVUM I 'benennen, verkünden', 'name, announce' (tr) (a/-/-)
          Prs IXb (a) *klāwäskau*,-, *klāwäṣṣäṃ*; — Imp —
               nt-Part *klāwäṣṣeñca*
               m-Part —
               Ger I — Abstr I —
          Sub IXb — Opt —
               Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
               Inf *klāwästsi*/*klāwastsi* (MQ)
          Pt —
          PPt —
          Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *klā(wäṣṣäṃ)* is restored by TochSprR(B) in 29 a 3 on the basis of the Sanskrit parallel version; the form is now also attested in THT 3603 frg. c b 1 and probably also in THT 1191 b 2.

= ^A*klāw^a*- 'benannt werden; verkünden; rezitieren', 'be called; announce; recite' (?) (x/-/m)
          Prs ? (x) -,-, *klăwa(ṣ)*; — | -,-, *klāwatär* (sic); — Imp —
               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I — Abstr I —
               Inf —

Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt I (m) —;-, *klāpac,*-
PPt —
Ipv —

According to Schmidt, 1974, 38, fn. 2, the middle present stem formations TA *klawatär* and TA *klawantär* attested in TochSprR(A) all belong to *Aklāwᵃ*- 'fall' "soweit der Kontext einen Schluß zuläßt" and the same is true for the active optative TA *klāwiṣ* (see Schmidt, 1974, 53, fn. 3 contra TG, 436). Nevertheless, two other present stem forms certainly belong to this root: alleged TA *[k]lawa–\////* in A 461 b 3 (thus TG, 436), because it translates Skt. *ākhyāti* 'announces, declares', and the recently discovered *klāwatṛa* (sic) that is a gloss on Skt. *paṭhaṃti* 'they recite' in SHT 5, 1098 frg. d. The long root vowel in *klāwatṛa* is odd at first glance, because in a present of Class IV one should have expected TA †*kla-*; but then a closer look on alleged TA *[k]lawa–\////* in A 461 b 3 reveals that there is too much space between the two akṣaras, so I am inclined to think that the form could have had a long *ā* as well: TA *[k]l(ā)wa–\////*. A present stem TA *klāwa-* would, of course, not be a present of Class IV, but one of Class V. Note that a Prs V stem TA *klāwa-* 'call' and a Prs IV stem TA *klawa-* 'fall' would not be homophonous, and that the semantics of the TA Prs do not fit those of the TB Prs IV at all. Finally, a restoration *kl(yǎ)wa–* with the palatal *ly* once attested for the respective TB present cannot be excluded either, although the restoration of a *(y)* alone would not be sufficient to explain the gap in the manuscript. As for the restoration of the word final in A 461 b 3, if we had to do with a Prs IV we would rather expect a middle TA *klǎwa(tär)*. But the left-hand ink traces of the akṣara rather speak in favor of ⟨ṣa⟩, i.e., of an active form *klǎwa(ṣ)*, which is what TG, 436 restores and likewise Couvreur, 1967, 159ff., who noticed that the left-hand part of leaf A 465 directly joins leaf A 461, so that we cannot restore more than one single akṣara; since in this manuscript the final sequence °*tär* is furthermore always written *tar*, *[k]l(ā)wa(ṣ)* is indeed the most likely restoration. Finally, we could also have a (kausativum) present Class VIII *[k]lǎw(äṣ)* here, which would fit the Kaus. I present stem in TB but would need the assumption of a misspelling, because one would expect some traces of *ä*-dots above the ⟨wa⟩, and TA *klāwatṛa* 'recites' cannot possibly be a Prs VIII. TA *klāpac* means 'you (pl.) have been called', and hence belongs to this root (pace TG, 436, s.v. *klāp-*), cf. TEB II, 99; Schmidt, 1974, 52.

SEM. The TB grundverb is intransitive (see Schmidt, 1974, 52 with fn. 1), which goes well with the morphology of the stem formations (Prs IV). The valency of the TA forms, on the other hand, is quite unclear as is the stem formation of the present forms. The manuals give a transitive meaning for Tocharian A on the evidence of TA "*[k]lawa–*" translating transitive Skt. *ākhyāti* 'announces, declares' in A 461 b 3. TA Pt *klāpac* can be either intransitive or passive; the valency of the Prs TA *klāwatṛa* 'recite(s) (?)' is unknown, although it is clear the semantics must have been basically that of the active form. Hence, there is

not too much evidence to claim that TA differentiates valency via voice rather than via stem alternation, as done by Schmidt, 1974, 52, fn. 1 (based on TA "*klawaṣ*" and TA *klāpac*). Etym. Certainly to be derived from PIE *√ḱleu̯ 'hear'. It might be crucial to know whether the TB present stem had an original palatal root initial or not, but it must be said that the TB Prs IV cannot be derived from a proto-form with the *ḱlēu̯- advocated by Hilmarsson, 1996, 146f. A present with root-initial palatalization is also the starting point for Widmer, 1998, 174ff., who sets up a full-grade Narten middle *ḱleu̯-o(-) (root present or aorist), claiming the TB *o*-vocalism of the present stem to be secondary. A present stem with non-palatalized *kl-*, on the other hand, is the basis of the analyses by Jasanoff, 1978, 46; Pinault, 1989, 138f; Hackstein, 1995, 322, and Katz, 1997, 69. They all set up a PIE present stem *ḱlou̯-éi̯e-; see also Ringe, 1991, 83f., fn. 65. Rasmussen, 1989, 161 reckons with a denominative from *ḱlou̯-éh₂-; similarly Adams, DoT, 222, who also proposes a denominative or a PIE intensive present, i.e., *ḱlōu̯-eh₂- or *ḱlōu̯-o-. The derivation of the 3.sg. Pt *klāwa* from a PIE "*ḱlou̯-ə" claimed by Schmidt, 1997c, 557ff. to have been the ancestor of the Ved. passive aorist *śrāvi* and originally "eine unreduplizierte Perfektbildung" would only make sense if one would like to explain the whole respective subclass of PT I that way. As it seems, the TB and the TA presents are best kept completely distinct; *klowotär* (with *kl-* being more original, as per Peters, 2006, 332, fn. 11) < pre-PT *klŏu̯ōi̯e/o-, TA *klāwa-* < pre-PT *klōu̯ei̯e/o-, or, perhaps more likely, a Prs V = *Sub V that was coined on the basis of an instr.sg. pre-PT *klŏu̯ō 'with hearing' in the same way as the Prs V = Sub V *iyā-* 'go; lead' was built upon an instr.sg. of *h₁(i)i̯eh₂- 'going'.

kläṅk- 'bezweifeln', 'doubt' (tr) (m/-/-)
      Prs I (m) -,-, *klyeñktär* (MQ, sic)/*klyentär* (MQ, sic); —
          Imp -,-, *klyeñcitär*; —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub I — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II *klaṅkälyñe* Priv —
          Inf *klaṅktsi*
      Pt III in
      PPt *keklaṅku*
      Ipv —

The Prs is certainly correctly analyzed as Prs I by the manuals, which will then be a quite remarkable archaism; see chap. Prs II. It is interesting to note that both present forms *klyeñktra* in 255 a 5 and *klyentra* in 254 a 3 (for expected *kleñtra* or *kleñktra*) are actually attested in two parallel texts, so maybe there was a problem in the original text from which both were copied. A PPt *keklaṅku* that looks like the regular PPt of a Pt III of this root is attested without context in the small fragment THT 1500 b 1. *klyeñci* //// in A(Ud.) 4 (= PK AS 6D) a 6 had better be restored to a middle form *klyeñci(tär)* (pace,

e.g., TEB II, 189), because the other attestations are middle forms, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 28.

= ᴬ*kläṅk*⁽ᵃ⁾?- '± zweifeln, unsicher sein', '± be in doubt, be insecure' (itr) (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I in
        PPt *kläṅko*
        Ipv —

Aɴᴛɪɢʀᴜɴᴅᴠᴇʀʙ 'bezweifeln', 'doubt' (tr) (-/a/-)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *kläṅkässi*
        Sub VII (a) — Opt —; *kläṅkñimäs,-,-*
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The formal antigrundverb form Sub VII TA *kläṅkñimäs* has the same meaning as the attested TB grundverb forms: A 349 b 2 *(kra)nt märkampal kläṅkñimäs* "we would/will doubt the dharma"; Inf TA *kläṅkässi* in A 454 a 2 is without context. According to Hilmarsson, 1991a, 71, the Sub VII belongs to the grundverb and is the equivalent of the TB Sub I stem, but the PPt TA *kläṅko* can only be derived from a stem with A-character (cf. chap. PPt), and Prs VIII and Sub VII are never paired with Pt I otherwise. Accordingly, TEB II, 99 sets up a grundverb paradigm for the PPt and a kausativum paradigm for the stems Prs VIII and Sub VII, and translates the root with '(be)streiten'. The translation 'streiten' is obviously based on the sole attestation of the PPt TA *kläṅkoṣ* in A 395 b 1, which is translated both by Thomas, 1956, 127 and Krause, 1971, 39 with "streitend", followed by Saito, 2006, 112. However, a translation "being in doubt (they entered the forest)" would not be too absurd. Eᴛʏᴍ. According to Adams, DoT, 222, to be derived from PIE *√kleng 'bend, turn' (Lat. *clingō*, not in ²LIV).

klänts⁽ᵃ⁾- 'schlafen', 'sleep' (itr) (a/a/a)

        Prs XII (a) -,-, *kläntsan-ne;-, kläṃtsañcer,-* Imp -,-, *kläntsaññi;*
                -,-, *kläntsañyeṃ*
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —

Sub V (a) — Opt -,-, *klantsoį̃*; —
Ger II — Abstr II *klantsalñe* Priv —
Inf —
Pt I (a) -,-, *klyantsa*; —
PPt —
Ipv —

klä[m]tsañcer is attested in G-Su 1 d (Pinault, 1987, 134), Pt I *kly(a)ntsa* in THT
1249 a 1. The subjunctive shows persistent initial accent.
= ᴬ*kliṣ*ᵃ- 'schlafen', 'sleep' (itr) (a/a/a)
Prs VI (a) -,-, *klisnāṣ*; — Imp -,-, *klisñā*; —
nt-Part *klisnānt*
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Inf *klisnātsi*
Sub V (a) -,-, *klesaṣ*; — Opt -,-, *klisiṣ*; —
Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt I (a) *klisā*, *klisāṣt*,-; —
PPt *kliso*
Ipv —
Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'zum Schlafen bringen', 'make sleep' (tr) (—)
Prs — Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Inf —
Sub IX — Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II *klisāṣlune*
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The meaning of the abstract TA *klisāṣlune* in A 247 b 3 (Thomas, 1957, 283
translates 'Schlafmittel') is now assured by the Sanskrit parallel VAV 2.38
providing the meaning 'Ruhenlassen'; see Schmidt, 1987, 158.
Eᴛʏᴍ. The PT root shape is *klän(t)s-, TA shows *i*-epenthesis (cf. Hilmarsson,
1996, 142). According to Schneider, 1940, 203f., and Hilmarsson, 1996, 142f.,
the root is derived from *√k̂leį̯ 'lean', i.e., from a present *k̂li-n-, but this
etymology would rather make us expect persistent (*)*kly*-. Adams, 1988a, 32,
and DoT, 223, derives it from PIE *klm̥H-s-, with a cognate in Skt. *klāmyati*
'become weary' (not in ²LIV).

*kläsk*ᵃ- 'set' → *kälsk*ᵃ- 'id.'

kli-n- 'müssen', 'be obliged to' (itr) (a/a/a)
Prs Xa (a) -,-, *klyinaṣṣäṃ/klinaṣṣäṃ*; — Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part —

                    Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub I/II (a) -,-, *klyin-ne*/*klin-ne*; — Opt -,-, *klyīñī* (sic)/*kliñi-ñ* (MQ);
                    -,-, *kliñeṃ*
                        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                        Inf —
        Pt III (a) -,-, *klaintsa*; —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
A 3.sg. Prs variant with initial *kly-* is attested in IOL Toch 390 b 2 (Peyrot,
2007, s.v.) and in SI B Toch 13,1 (M. Peyrot, p.c.). For the 3.sg. Sub **kliṃ* cf.
3.sg. *auṃ* from *au(-n)-* 'hit'. The 3.pl. Opt *kliñeṃ* without *ly* is now also
attested in exactly the same spelling in a parallel text of 220 b 5, i.e., THT 1539
frg. a a [recte b] 4 (cf. Schmidt, 2006, 466). The Pt *klaintsa-ñ* listed in TEB II,
189, is attested in the fragment edited sub 520 (now = THT 1552 frg. d a 1).
= ᴬ***kli-n-*** 'müssen', 'be obliged to' (itr) (a/m/-)
        Prs X (a) -, *klināṣt*,-; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub I/II (m) -,-, *klintar* (sic)/*klyintär*; — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
On the reading, see also TG, "Nachträge", 487. The Sub stem is ambiguous
because TA *ñ* can (occasionally) be depalatalized before *°t*. What is certain is
that synchronically the stem is not to be analyzed as Sub VII (as has to be
done in the cases of roots like ᴬ*o(-n)-* or ᴬ*ri(-n)-* that still lack final *-n-* in some
categories), because in Sub VII forms the *-ñ-* is always palatal, also before *-t-*.
Hilmarsson, 1991a, 116 therefore correctly regards this stem as an archaism
and assigns the TA subjunctive stem to Class I; cf. chap. Sub VII 22.2.2.
Eᴛʏᴍ. The root is usually derived from PIE *√k̂leị̯ 'lean', notably from the PIE
nasal present stem *k̂l̥-né-i̯-/-n-i̯- (cf. esp. Praust, 2004, 384f.), which was
apparently replaced by *kli-nu- in PT; see Adams, DoT, 224; Hilmarsson, 1996,
150f. (²LIV, 332f., without this Toch. root), and chap. Sub VII 22.2.2.

ᴬ***klisä̈-*** 'sleep' → *klänts⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'id.'

klutk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich umdrehen, werden', 'turn, become' (itr) (m/-/-)
        Prs VII (m) —;-,-, *kluttaṅkentär* Imp —;-,-, *kluttañciyentär*
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

Inf *klutkatsi* (sic)

Pt I in
PPt *klutkau*
Ipv —

The Imp *kluttañciyent(rä)* is found in PK NS 69 b 4 (G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The Inf *[k]lutkatsi* is arguably attested in THT 1446 a 3 (provenance unknown, but the texts does not seem to have MQ character), so we are dealing with an initially accented Sub V stem. A-character is also to be expected judged by the rest of the averbo.

KAUSATIVUM I 'werden lassen, machen zu', 'make, turn into' (tr) (x/-/x)

Prs IXb (x) -,-, *klutkäṣṣän-ne/klutkaṣṣäṃ* (MQ);-,-, *klutkäskeṃ*
| -,-, *klutkästär;*— Imp —;-,-, *klutkäṣṣiyeṃ*
nt-Part *klutkäṣṣeñca*
m-Part *klutkäskemane*
Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub IXb — Opt —
Ger II *klutkäṣlyi* Abstr II — Priv —
Inf *klutkästsi*
Pt II (x) -, *klyautkasta, klyautka;*— | -, *klyautkatai, klyautkate;*
klyautkāmte,-,-
PPt *keklyutkuwa | keklyutkoṣ*
Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *klutkäṣṣäṃ* is attested very often, e.g., in THT 1512 b 4: *ñ(a)kteṃ śāmna ākt[e]ke po klutkaṣ[ṣ]aṃ* "läßt Götter und Menschen ganz erstaunt werden", cf. Thomas, 1997, 98 (without text ref.). Middle Prs *klutkästär* is attested in PK AS 7M b 1, Ger II *klutkäṣlyi* in PK AS 17D b 2 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The 2.sg.mid. Pt *klyautkatai* is found in THT 3597 (= Mainz 655, 1) a 5 (MQ), cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 273. On the 1.pl.mid. *klyautkā(m)t(e)*, see chap. Pt II 8.1.4. Beside the fem. PPt *keklyutkusai*, a plural *keklyutkuwa* is attested in K 2 (= PK AS 7B) a 2, cf. Saito, 2006, 454 with fn. 65. The oblique PPt *keklyutkoṣ* is found in THT 1550 a 2.

~ *ᴬlutk⁽ᵃ⁾?-* 'werden lassen, machen zu', 'make, turn into' (tr) (a+/a/x)

Prs VIII (a+) -,-, *lutkäṣṣ-äṃ;*— Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part *lutkäsmāṃ*
Ger I — Abstr I —
Inf *lutkässi*
Sub IX (a) — Opt -,-, *lyutkāṣiṣ;*—
Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt II (x) -,-, *lyalyutäk;*— | -,-, *lyalyutkāt;*—
Pt III (a) *lyockwā, lyockäṣt,-;*—
PPt —
Ipv —

ETYM. The TB and TA root are usually both derived from PT *kläwtk-, based on the assumption that TA *l-* is due to dissimilatory loss of initial (*)*k-;* see

Adams, DoT 225f. with ref. The root is generally derived from a *u*-extension of PIE *√kʷelh₁ 'turn' (root etymology first proposed by Pedersen, 1941, 171; see Melchert, 1978, 121; Adams, DoT, 225f.; ²LIV, 387ff. without this Toch. root); we should then expect *kʷluh₁-T-sḱ-, which possibly was to turn into PT *kl'äwtk-. See also *klautk⁽ᵃ⁾-/*ᴬlotkᵃ-* 'turn, become'.

klupᵃ- 'reiben', 'rub, squeeze' (tr) (a/-/-)

        Prs VI (a) -,-, *klupnātär*; — Imp —
               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
               Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
               Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The manuals cite this form as *kluṣnātär* (334 b 8 and 9; on the text see Schmidt, 1997, 238ff.). Adams, 1983, 611, with fn. 1 and DoT, 226, on the other hand, rather wants to read *klup-* instead of *kluṣ-* "since there is no source for the palatalization of *-s-*. Instead we have here a sloppy writing of *-p-*". In view of the akṣara ⟨prā⟩ in line b 1 Adams' view can be supported paleographically. The TA hapax *klu[ṣtä](r)* in A 461 b 4 translates Skt. *(u)[ttānī]karoti* 'explains', and cannot be equated with this TB form for purely semantic reasons apart from the question whether to read *p* or *ṣ*; see below *ᴬklu(ṣ)-*.

kluṣ- 'rub' → *klupᵃ-* 'id.'

ᴬklu(ṣ)- 'erklären', 'explain' (?) (m/-/-)

        Prs II/VIII (m) -,-, *kluṣtär*; — Imp —
               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I — Abstr I —
               Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
               Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Hapax in A 461 b 4 corresponding to Skt. *(u)[ttānī]karoti* 'explains'; see Couvreur, 1967, 162 (TG, 437 incorrectly restored *(sa)ntānī*). We are either dealing with a Prs VIII built to an *s*-less root TA *klu-*, or with a Prs II built to a root TA *kluṣ-*.

ᴬklepsᵃ- 'dry up' → *klaiksᵃ-* 'id.'

klaiks^a̯- 'vertrocknen; verkümmern', 'dry up, wither; be afflicted' (itr) (m/-/-)

        Prs IV (m) -, *klaiksotar*,-; — Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub V — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

            Inf *klaiksatsi*

        Pt I in

        PPt *kaklaiksau*

        Ipv —

The 3.sg. *klaiksotär* listed in TEB I, 202, § 363,2 without ref. is probably attested in THT 1536 frg. a a 1. The subjunctive seems to have persistent initial accent.

~ ^A*kleps^a̯-* 'vertrocknen', 'dry up, wither' (itr) (—)

        Prs — Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

            Inf —

        Sub V — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II *klepslune*

        Pt I in

        PPt *kāklepsunt*

        Ipv —

ETYM. Evidently a denominative PT *klāyksā-; for the sound law PT *-ks- > TA -*ps*-, see now Pinault, 2008, 49. To be connected with (Epic) Skt. √kliś 'be troubled, afflicted' (as first proposed by Burrow) ← *√k^(u̯)lei̯k̂ (²LIV, 363 without Toch.); see Adams, DoT, 228f.

^A*klop-^iññ-* 'klagen', 'express sorrow, lament' (itr) (m/-/-)

        Prs XII (m) — Imp —;-,-, *klopiññānt*

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

            Inf —

        Sub — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

Hapax in YQ 22 a 6 of ascertained meaning (see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 150ff. with fn. 5). ETYM. Denominative of TA *klop* 'sorrow'.

klautk⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'umkehren, werden', 'turn, become' (itr) (m/a/a)

        Prs IV (m) *klautkomar,-, klautkotär;-,-, klautkontär* Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I *klautkolle* Abstr I —

        Sub V (a) *klautkau*, *klautkāt* (MQ), *klautkaṃ;* — Opt -,-, *klautkoy*;

                klautkoyem,-, klautkoṃ

                Ger II *klautkalle* (sic) Abstr II *klautkalyñe* (MQ)

                        Priv *aṅklautkatte*

                Inf *klautkattsi* (MQ)

        Pt I (a) *klautkāwa,-, klautka;-,-, klautkāre*

        PPt *kaklautkau| kaklautkaṣ*

        Ipv I (a) *päklautka;-*

The 1.sg. Prs *k[l]autkomar* is also attested in THT 1249 b 3; the 2.sg. Sub *klautkā<t>* is, in my opinion, attested in PK AS 12F b 4 (MQ). Thomas, 1979b, 45 quotes the passage as: "*klyomai klautkā ñäke näpi* (lies: *mäpi*)" with the translation "[o] Edler, wende dich jetzt doch nicht ab!", the reading is confirmed by G.-J. Pinault, p.c. (we have to do with a text in old ductus, i.e., a ⟨ma⟩ in the old shape, cf. Malzahn, 2007a, 261, so it has to be read *mäpi* indeed). Adams, DoT, 229, following Thomas' translation, analyzes *klautkā* as Ipv I, which is possible despite the spelling, because we have an MQ text before us. However, since we rather expect a preventive in this passage, I would propose that we have to restore a 2.sg. Sub *klautkā<t>*. The 3.pl. Sub *klautkoṃ* is attested in PK AS 4B b 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). Schmidt, 1974, 44, fn. 2 correctly states that the restoration of a middle form *kl(au)tk[o](y)[t](rä)* from this root by TochSprR(B) in 245 b 1 is uncertain. A look at the manuscript reveals that there is actually no trace of, and no space for, a ⟨y⟩ above the visible traces of the ⟨t⟩, so one should better read a 3.pl.act. Opt *kl(au)tk[o](ṃ) [t](··)*. An Abstr *klyautkalyñe* (sic) is also attested in 100 b 2: *mā ñiś pratinmeṃ klyautkalyñe nesau* "von meinem Entschluß werde ich nicht umkehren", cf. Thomas, 1952, 39. TochSprR(B) wanted to emend the form to *klyautkalle*, because the copula is generally constructed with the gerundive, not with an abstract. Thomas, l.c., quotes the form as (expected) *klautkalyñe*, but the manuscript has indeed initial *kly-*. A clear attestation of the Ger *klautkalle* is found in THT 1681 b 4 (no MQ character); in 85 a 4 such a form has also to be restored: *pratinmeṃ [kl]au(tkalle nest)* "(du wirst doch nicht) von deinem Entschluß umkehren", cf. TochSprR(B) and Thomas, 1952, 40. In sum, the subjunctive seems to have persistent initial accent. Instead of an Ipv *(päklau)tk(a)so* (thus TochSprR(B), transl. 12, fn. 1), one should rather restore *(pi)tk(a)so* in 7 a 3; see WTG, 288 and Thomas, ²TochSprR(B), 151, i.e., an Ipv of *wätk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'command'.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'zur Umkehr bringen', 'make turn' (tr) (a/-/-)

        Prs IXb (a) -,-, *klautkäṣṣäṃ;* — Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

          Ger I *klautkäṣṣälya* (MQ) Abstr I —

Sub IXb — Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II *klautkäṣlñe* Priv —

          Inf *klautkästsi*

Pt —

PPt —

Ipv IV (m) -; *päklautkäṣṣat*

~ ^A*lotk^ā-* 'umkehren, werden', 'turn, become' (itr) (a/a/a)

        Prs VII (a) -,-, *lotäṅkāṣ*;-,-, *lotäṅke* Imp —

           nt-Part —

           m-Part —

           Ger I — Abstr I —

           Inf —

        Sub V (a) -,-, *lotkaṣ*;-, *lotkac*, *lotke* Opt -,-, *lotkiṣ*;—

           Ger II *lotkal* Abstr II *lotklune*

        Pt I (a) -, *lotkaṣt*, *lotäk*;-,-, *lotkar*

        PPt *lālotku*

        Ipv I (a) *plotäk*;-

ETYM. Evidently a denominative (thus Adams, DoT 230); differently, Hilmarsson, 1991, 25ff.; 1996, 144f.

^A*klyos-* 'hear, listen to' → *klyaus-* 'id.'

 klyaus- 'hören', 'hear, listen to' (tr) (x/a/x)

        Prs II (x) -,-, *klyauṣäṃ*;-,-, *klyauseṃ* | -,-, *klyauṣtär/klye͜uṣtär* (MQ);

           -,-, *klyausentär* Imp *klyauṣim*, *klyauṣit*,-;

           -,-, *klyauṣiyeṃ/klyauṣyeṃ* | -,-, *klyauṣītär*;—

           nt-Part —

           m-Part *klyausemane*

           Ger I *klyauṣalle/ klye͜uṣälle* (MQ) Abstr I —

        Sub II (a) -, *klyauṣt*, *klyauṣäṃ*;— Opt -,-, *klyauṣi*;-,-, *klyauṣiyeṃ*

           Ger II — Abstr II *klyauṣalñe* Priv *eṅklyauṣäcce*

           Inf *klyauṣtsi* (Š)/*klyaussi/klyewṣtsī* (MQ)

        Pt I (x) *klyauṣāwa*,-, *klyauṣa/klyewṣa* (MQ);-, *klyauṣāso*, *klyauṣāre/*

           klyewṣare (MQ) | -, *klyauṣātai*, *klyauṣāte*;—

        PPt *keklyauṣu* | *keklyauṣoṣ*

        Ipv VII (a) *päklyauṣ/ pklyauṣ* (S); *päklyauṣso/*

            pklyausso (S)/*päklyauṣtso* (MQ)

The 2.sg. Sub *klyauṣt* is attested in KVāc 24 a 4 (see Schmidt, 1986, 56), the 3.sg.mid. Imp *klyauṣītär* in PK AS 15D a 6 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). A 2.sg. Pt *klyauṣātai* is only listed in TochSprR(B), glossary, 118, as is a 2.pl. Ipv *päklyauṣäs*, but since the latter form would be highly irregular (although not diachronically impossible) and cannot be found anywhere in the texts available, I hesitate to list it. The reduced 2.sg. Ipv

variant *pklyauṣ* is attested in 114 a 1, a text from Sängim like the similar 2.pl.
Ipv *pklyausso*. For the hypercorrect *päklyauṣtso*, see Peyrot, 2008, 87.
= ^A***klyos-*** 'hören', 'hear, listen to' (tr) (x/a/a)

       Prs II (x) -,-, *klyoṣtär*; — Imp —;-, *klyoṣās,-*
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I *klyoṣlaṃ* Abstr I —
           Inf *klyossi*
       Prs X (x) —; *klyosäṃsamäs,-, klyosäṃseñc/klyosnseñc* |
           -,-, *klyosnäṣtär*;— Imp *klyosäṃṣāwä,-,-*; —
           nt-Part *klyosäṃṣantāñ*
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
           Inf *klyosnässi*
       Sub II (a) -,-, *klyoṣäṣ;-,-, klyoseñc* Opt —;-,-, *klyoṣiñc*
           Ger II *klyoṣäl* Abstr II *klyoṣlune*
       Pt I (a) *klyoṣā,-, klyoṣ; klyoṣāmäs, klyoṣās, klyoṣār*
       PPt *kaklyuṣu*
       Ipv VI (a) *päklyoṣ; päklyoṣäs/päklyossū*

On the secondary Prs X stem formation, see Hackstein, 1994, 320ff. The Ipv TA
päklyossū is not a form of the 3.sg. (pace the manuals; see already Pedersen,
1941, 150), but 2.pl. (thus Schmidt, 1974, 237f.); as for the further analysis of
the form, I follow Pinault, 2005, 515ff., who interprets it as the equivalent of
TB *päklyauṣso*. The 1.sg. TA *klyoṣā* in A 20 a 6 and b 3 is rather a preterit than
an imperfect, because we have a non-remote past tense here: *ptāñkte ñom
klyoṣā* "(just now) I have heard the name 'Buddha'", cf. Sieg, Übers. I, 23f.; for
the use of the preterit as non-remote past tense, see Thomas, 1956, 199ff. The
other attestations of TA *klyoṣā* are unclear in this respect; this is also true for
the new attestations in the small fragments THT 1137 a 2 and THT 1525 a 2.
On the Pt and Imp, see chap. Pt I 7.3.9.
SEM. The middle has only passive function, the 3.sg. can have the impersonal
meaning 'it is said' (see Schmidt, 1974, 81, and 217ff.). ETYM. The root is
certainly to be derived from PIE *√ḱleu̯ 'hear'; see the detailed discussion by
Hackstein, 1995, 320ff.; Adams, DoT, 232f.; and Peters, 2006, 332ff. with ref.

kw^ạ- 'rufen, einladen', 'call, invite' (tr) (m/-/-)
       Prs V (m) *kwāmar-c,-, kwātär-ne;-,-, kwāntär*
           Imp -,-, *kwoytär-ne;-,-, kwoyentär*
           nt-Part —
           m-Part *kwāmane*
           Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf —
       Pt —
       PPt —

Ipv —

Outside the present stem, *kāk^a-* 'call' provides the suppletive root. ETYM. Usually derived from PIE *√ĝʰu̯eH 'rufen' (²LIV, 180f.; Adams, DoT, 235), but Hackstein, 2002a, 192f. now prefers *√geu̯h₂ 'rufen' (²LIV, 189).

kwäññ- '?' → *wänt^a-* 'cover'

kwär- 'age' → *kur^a?-* 'id.'

[*kwäl-* 'schleppen (?)' listed by WTG, 243; TEB II, 190 is a ghost root. The alleged Sub *kwelem* in 118 b 2 is a color adjective; see Schmidt, 1984, 152f. and 1985, 429; the Sanskrit parallel version Schmidt, 1984 is referring to without explicitly mentioning it is Pāt 59, on which see von Simson, 2000, 297; the alleged Priv *ekwalatte* rather means 'unrelenting, unabating' and belongs to *kul^a-* 'recede'; see Hilmarsson, 1991, 64ff.]

kwäs^a- 'wehklagen', 'lament' (itr) (m/?/-)
        Prs VI (m) -,-, *kwäsnātär*;— Imp —; -,-, *kusnontär* (S)
             nt-Part —
             m-Part *kwasnāmane* (sic)
             Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V (?) — Opt —; -,-, *kwāsoye(ntär)* (S)
             Ger II — Abstr II in *kwasalñeṣṣa* (Š) Priv —
             Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The isolated 3.pl.mid. Imp *kusnonträ* in 387 frg. 4 was analyzed as a form from this root by Hilmarsson, 1996, 195; for *ku* as equivalent of standard *kwä* in the eastern variety, see Fellner, 2006, 51ff. *kwasnāmane* in 431 a 3 (MQ) is certainly simply an error for *kwäsnāmane* (the small text shows many misspellings of that kind). Couvreur, 1954, 86 doubts that contextless *kwāsoye(ṃ)* in the fragment 116 frg. 10 (now = THT 1575 frg. b a 5) is a 3.pl. Opt from this root (thus, e.g., WTG, 243; TEB I, 228, § 412,2), but since it is attested after punctuation (• *[k]wāsoye ////*), at least the word separation is certain. Since there are only middle forms attested otherwise, and, what is more, intransitive verbs usually do not show voice alternation, this form should further be restored to middle *kwāsoye(ntär)*. If the analysis is correct, we have here a subjunctive with initial accent. ETYM. *√k̂u̯es 'schnaufen, schnauben, seufzen' (²LIV, 341); see Adams, DoT, 237.

kwipe-ññ- 'sich schämen', 'be ashamed' (itr) (m/-/m)
        Prs XII (m) -, *kwipentar, kwipentär*;-,-, *kwipeññentär* Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —

                              Ger I — Abstr I —
                    Sub — Opt —
                              Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                              Inf —
                    Pt V (m) -,-, *kwipeññate*; —
                    PPt —
                    Ipv —

2.sg. Prs *kwipentar* is attested in the small fragment THT 1621 frg. b a 3: ////
sa • kwipentar twe ykaṃṣanta[r] //// "you feel ashamed [and] disgusted".
ETYM. A denominative based on *kwipe* 'shame'; see Hilmarsson, 1991a, 82ff.
(who, more precisely, sets up an *n*-stem *kwipen- 'shame' as basis of the
denominative); see also Hilmarsson, 1996, 208; Adams, DoT, 238.

^A**ksā-** '± beleuchten, bescheinen', '± shine, illuminate' (?) (—)
                    Prs — Imp —
                              nt-Part —
                              m-Part —
                              Ger I — Abstr I —
                              Inf —
                    Sub — Opt —
                              Ger II — Abstr II —
                    Pt I in
                    PPt *kākṣont*
                    Ipv —

The proposed meanings range between 'shine' and 'blind'; see Carling,
DThTA, s.v. According to Carling, l.c., a 3.sg.mid. Sub TA *ksātär* is further
attested in the small fragment THT 1149 a 4. The PT pre-form is *ksāyā-,
*ksāwā-, or *ksāw'ā-; see Hilmarsson, 1996, 184f.; differently Saito, 2006, 452.

C

cäṅk- 'gefallen', 'please' (itr) (a/a/-)
                    Prs II (a) -,-, *cäñśäṃ* (MQ)/*cäñcan-me*; — Imp —
                              nt-Part —
                              m-Part —
                              Ger I — Abstr I —
                    Sub I/II (a) — Opt —;-,-, *cäñcyeṃ* (MQ)
                              Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                              Inf —
                    Pt —
                    PPt —
                    Ipv —

A verbal form *cäñśä(ṃ)* //// is restored by TochSprR(B) in 139 b 5. A 3.sg. Prs
cäñcaṃ-ne is also attested in H 149.330 a 1 and in the Paris collection. The
small fragment THT 1536 frg. d a 2 (MQ) probably shows the 3.pl. Opt

cäñcyeṃ, but the form is without much context. Eᴛʏᴍ. PIE *√teng̑/g 'dünken, scheinen' (²LIV, 629, without Toch.); see Adams, DoT, 253.

cämp- 'können, vermögen', 'be able to' (itr) (a/a/a)

    Prs II (a) *campau, -, campäṃ;-, campcer/camcer/camñcer* (S),
       campeṃ
       Imp -,-, *campi;—*
       nt-Part —
       m-Part —
       Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub II (a) -, *campät,-;-,-, campeṃ* Opt *cämpim,-, campi;-,-,*
       cämpiyeṃ/cämpyeṃ
       Ger II *cämpalle* Abstr II — Priv —
       Inf —
    Pt I (a) *cämyāwa* (sic), *cimpyāsta, campya;-, cämpyās, cämpyāre*
    PPt —
    Ipv —

On the evidence of the quite often attested 3.pl. Prs/Sub *campeṃ* (e.g., also in THT 3041 b 2) and esp. the 1.sg. Prs *campau*, the present and subjunctive stem is thematic (cf. Schmidt, 1985, 425f.).

= ᴬ**cämp-** 'können, vermögen', 'be able to' (itr) (a+/a/a)

    Prs II (a+) *cämpam, cämpät, cämpäṣ;-, cämpäc, cämp(e)ñc* Imp —
       nt-Part —
       m-Part *cämpamāṃ*
       Ger I — Abstr I —
       Inf —
    Prs VIII (a) — Imp -,-, *cämṣṣā* (sic)/*cämṣā/cimṣā;—*
       nt-Part —
       m-Part —
       Ger I — Abstr I —
       Inf —
    Sub II (a) — ;-,-, *cämpe* Opt -,-, *cämpiṣ;—*
       Ger II *cämpäl* Abstr II *cämplune*
    Pt III (a) *camwā/campu,-, campäs;-,-, campär*
    PPt —
    Ipv —

TA *cämpam* in A 191 b 3 is more likely 1.sg. Prs (or Sub) than an adjective with a strange -*a*- vowel: TA //// (*eṃ?)tsässi mā śkaṃ cämpam*｜｜ "Can I not (tak?)e", as proposed by Winter, 1977, 144 = 1984, 190 = 2005, 181. A 1.sg. (Prs or Sub) seems also attested in the small fragment THT 1592 frg. a a 2: TA *mā cämpam-ci waṣtāṣi* "I can't ... you (sg.) the ... pertaining to the house". As for the single attestation of the 3.pl. Prs, the suffix vowel is damaged, but the stem can nevertheless be analyzed as synchronically thematic on the evidence of the subjunctive stem (3.pl. Sub TA *cämpe*), cf. Winter, 1977, 143f. = 1984, 189 = 2005, 180f. The *m*-Part TA *(cä)mp[a]māṃ* in A 227/8 b 1 was said to be "bedenklich wegen der volleren Endung -*amāṃ*" by Sieg (apud TG, 437, fn. 1),

but the form is attested with certainty: TA *(cä)mp[a]mām̐ k(ā)su yatsi puk wäknā* "being able to behave well in every manner", and is the diachronically expected one; it is rather the forms lacking -*a*- like the *m*-Part TA *pärmām̐* that are irregular (see chap. Prs II 25.1.3.). As for the adjective TA *cämpamo* 'able' showing -*amo* instead of expected †-*äm* (TA *cämpam* in A 191 b 3 is a finite verbal form; see above), Winter, l.c., no doubt correctly took it to be borrowed from TB *cämpamo* 'id.'. TA *c(a)mpu* in A 230 a 4 is not a PPt (thus TG, 438), but a 1.sg. Pt, as per Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 53 = Winter, 2005, 437. Arguing that a Pt III beside a Sub II is unusual, Winter, 1977, 143 = 1984, 189 = 2005, 180 claimed the thematic subjunctive stem to have replaced a former athematic one. However, there is nothing wrong with a Sub II having as root vowel pre-PT **e* standing beside a Pt III, and, more particularly, no reason for not deriving the Prs/Sub II found with this root from a suffixless thematic root present. (Pace Ringe, 2000, 130f., one should have expected a pre-PT present stem in **-p-i̯e/o-* to end up either as a TB Sub IV or as a Prs/Sub II with -*i*-/-*ye*- inflection, cf. the case of *cepy-*.) For the strange Pt I formation met in Tocharian B, see Peters, 2006, 341f.; one could toy with the idea that the strange TA Imp that seems to be derived from an otherwise unattested Prs VIII also had started out as a formation in **-yā-*, and that **-pyā-* then was acoustically perceived as a phonetic variant of phonemic /**-pṣā-*/.
Etym. PIE **√temp-* 'spannen, dehnen' (²LIV, 626); see Adams, DoT, 253f.

cepy- '?' (itr) (—)

    Prs II — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *cepyemane*
        Ger I *ceppille* (sic) Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

Ger *ceppille* is attested in the Vinaya text H 149.X.4 (= HMR 2) a 1 (its parallel text H add.149 84 a 2 offering *ceppile*); the passage apparently treats the casuistics of Pāt 89 (concerning blankets): H 149.X.4 a 1f. *saṅkik raktsisa ṣam[ā]nentse • eñatketse mā ceppille mā wsaṣṣälle* "on a blanket belonging to the community a monk shall neither *ceppille* nor lie, [if he is] *eñatketse*" (see Couvreur, 1954a, 45, and Broomhead I, 70f.). The respective Pāli passage Pāc 89 does not discuss sitting rugs; the VinVibh of the Sarvastivadins (see Rosen, 1959, 213) states apud Pāt 89 that the Buddha ordered the monks to prepare blankets "zum Schutz der Gemeindebetten". *ceppille* is usually translated by '± tread on' (first by WTG, 244). The interpretation of the passage is, however, also further difficult because *eñatketse* is a hapax as well. Couvreur (l.c.) and Broomhead (II, 53) propose for *eñatketse* 'not ill', others take the form to be derived from *nätkᵃ-* with the meaning 'support', i.e. 'ohne Stütze (?)', thus

Thomas, 1954, 761; Bernhard, 1958, 34; TEB II, 171; Hilmarsson, 1991, 180; recently Carling, 2000, 174. On the other hand, Melchert, 1978, 123f., following a proposal by Jasanoff, 1978, 39, has shown that *nätk^a-* rather means 'push (away)', so Melchert translated: "a monk is not to step or sit on the mat belonging to the congregation without prompting (i.e. 'without invitation')". But this would be an odd rule, since monks can usually use community belongings without prompting, and the other rules concerning community property usually deal with prevention of damage or destruction of the goods (cf., e.g., Pāt 14 concerning the use of community sitting rugs outdoors, or CV V.11.4, that prohibits monks to tread on a *kaṭhina* cloth with shoes or unwashed feet). Whether we are here also faced with preventing damage or destruction of a community sitting rug depends on the meaning of *eñatketse*, for which I will not venture a guess. Another possible interpretation may be suggested by the use of the verb *wäs-* 'dwell, abide, lie' in this rule instead of *lyäk-* 'lie', indicating that the rule may concern the continuous use of a community rug, i.e., *cepy-* may convey some kind of confiscation. Finally, the *m*-Part in 386 a 5 is without context.

cele-ññ- 'zum Vorschein kommen', 'appear' (itr) (m/-/-)
        Prs XII (m) -,-, *celentär*, — Imp —;-,-, *celeñiyentär*
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
ETYM. Perhaps denominative; a basic noun is, however, unattested. The hapax adj. *celāmäññana* (fem.) in 290, 1 is often cited as a possible cognate of this verb, but its meaning is uncertain (WTG, 244 'hervorstechend?'), and in any case rather belongs to the adj. *celāmo* for morphological reasons; see Winter, 1981, 128; Hilmarsson, 1991a, 88f.

Ñ

ñäsk- 'verlangen, begehren', 'demand, desire' (tr) (x/a/a)
        Prs II (x) -,-, *ñäṣṣäṃ* (MQ); *ñäskem*,-, *ñaskeṃ* | *ñäskemar, ñaṣtar,*
                ñaṣtär,-,-, *ñäskentär/ñiskeṃtär* Imp -,-, *ñaṣṣi*; —
                | *ñaṣṣīmar* (sic), *ñäṣṣitar, ñäṣṣītär/ñṣṣītär*;-,-, *ñäṣyentär*
                nt-Part *ñäṣṣeñca*
                m-Part *ñäskemane*
                Ger I *ñiṣṣalle* (sic) Abstr I —
        Sub II (a) *ñäskau-ne*,-,-; — Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

          Inf —

Pt I (a) -,-, *ñaṣṣa/ ñiṣṣā-me*; —

Pt II (a) —;-,-, *ñāssare*

PPt —

Ipv —

A 3.pl.act. Prs (or Sub) *ñaskeṃ* is attested in THT 1168 b 4, the 3.pl. variant *ñiskeṃträ* in THT 1404 frg. h a 2. The 1.sg. *ñäskau-ne* in Amb (= PK NS 32) b 2 is rather a subjunctive (thus Adams, DoT, 267), not a present form (pace Winter, 2001, 130 = 2005, 519 ad 45); see the translations of the passage by Couvreur, 1955, 112 and Schmidt, 1974, 152; no translation is found in Thomas, 1965; use as a subjunctive denoting the future is also attested for the 1.sg. in 100 a 1, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 152. The 1.sg.mid. *ñäskemar* in 241 b 5 is a present (Pinault, 2008, 344), and another instance of this Prs form *ñäskemar* is found in 228 b 4 (not in WTG, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 155). The attested forms in -*ĭ*- all seem to be imperfects, with the exception of 3.pl. *ñäṣyentär* in 57 b 3, which can also be taken for an optative. The Ger I *ñiṣṣalle* is found sub 598 frg. 1 (= THT 1127 frg. c a 5), in PK NS 95 a 3 (see Pinault, 2000, 82), THT 1341 b 4, and a variant *[ñ]äṣṣalle* probably in the small fragment THT 1460 frg. a b 5. The 3.sg. Pt *ñiṣṣā-me* is attested in PK NS 31 b 6 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The 3.pl. Pt *ñāssare* in 331 a 5 (S) can only be analyzed as a preterit of Class II, but one that was built from a stem **ñāssā-* instead of *ñäsk-*; see Hilmarsson, 1991, 115; the manuals set up the same meaning for this form as for the stem *ñäsk-*, and a translation 'demanded' or 'let demand' makes some sense in this passage, which, nevertheless, is open to debate; D. Q. Adams (p.c.) rather proposes 'shared'; unfortunately, the Old Turkish gloss under *ñāssare* is unclear itself: according to Maue, 2009, 25, we have *ay(ı)g [˙]šuŋlasarlar* "wenn sie a. x-en" with various different analyses being possible for *ay( )g*; according to Maue, no restoration for the Turkish verbal form suggests itself with respect to the Toch. passage. ETYM. From a (pre-PT) *e*-grade formation **nes-ske/o-* with the root vowel **e* owed to a general Narten behavior of the root; see Adams, DoT, 267f. and Malzahn, 2007, 237ff. (the argument made there p. 243f. on 3.pl. Pt II *ñāssare* can be improved by the additional assumption that an original 3.sg. act. Pt I **ñāssa* had been reinterpreted as a Pt II form thanks to word-initial *ñ-*; see my parallel analysis of the Pt II form *yātante* from *yāt(a)-* 'be (cap)able').

T

tā- 'put, set' → *tās-* 'id.'

tāk^a- 'sein, werden', 'be, become' (itr) (-/a/a)

        Prs — Imp —

             nt-Part —

             m-Part —

          Ger I — Abstr I —

Sub V (a) *tākau, tākat, tākaṃ; tākam, tākacer, tākaṃ*

          Opt *tākoym/tākom, tākoyt, tākoy; tākoyem, tākoycer, tākoyeṃ/tākoṃ*

          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv *atākatte*

          Inf —

Pt I (a) *takāwa, takāsta, tāka;-, takās, takāre*

PPt *tatākau| tatākaṣ*

Ipv I (a) *ptāka/tāka; ptākas*

The 1.sg. Opt *tākom* is attested in THT 1540 frg. f + g a 5 (see Schmidt, 2007, 323), the Ipv variant *tāka* in the letter PK LC XXVII, 3: *kärtse śommo tāka* "Be a good person!" (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The subjunctive stem has persistent initial accent.

= ᴬ*tāk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sein, werden', 'be, become' (itr) (-/a/a)

          Prs — Imp —

              nt-Part —

              m-Part —

              Ger I — Abstr I —

              Inf —

          Sub V (a) *tām, tāt, tāṣ; tāmäs, tāc, tākeñc/tāke/teñc/te*

             Opt *tākim, tākit, tākiṣ; tākimäs,-, tākiñc*

              Ger II — Abstr II —

          Pt I (a) *tākā, tākaṣt, tāk/tāka-ṃ; tākmäs,-, tākar;-,-, tākenes*

          PPt —

          Ipv I (a) *päṣtāk(-ñi); päṣtākäs/pṣtākäs*

A 2.sg. Sub TA *tāt-äṃ* is probably also attested in A 108 a 4 (thus TG, 444, with question mark); see below s.v. ᴬ*mäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'press'. Instead of TA *taken[a]s* (thus the manuals), one has to restore to a 3. dual Pt *tāken(e)s* in A 354 a 6, according to Pinault, 2005, 503.

Aɴᴛɪɢʀᴜɴᴅᴠᴇʀʙ/Kᴀᴜꜱᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'werden zu lassen', 'make to be' (tr) (—)

          Prs VIII — Imp —

              nt-Part —

              m-Part —

              Ger I *tākäṣlis* Abstr I —

              Inf —

          Sub — Opt —

              Ger II — Abstr II —

          Pt —

          PPt —

          Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. *nes-/*ᴬ*nas-* 'be' provides the suppletive present stem (and the PPt in TA), and in addition as suppletive subjunctive stem for the formation of the Ger II and Abstr II (in TA and TB) and the infinitive (in TB). As per Batke, 1999, passim, this root shows the same semantics as *nes-/*ᴬ*nas-* 'be', i.e., can function both as copula and as a verb of existence; on the other hand, it also can have the meaning 'become' just like ᴬᴮ*mäsk⁽ᵃ⁾-*. Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from PIE *√steh₂

'put, place'; see Hackstein, 1993, 158ff. in detail. The Ipv TA *päṣtāk* has preserved the old root-initial sibilant. As for the morphological details, Hackstein, 1993, 161 claimed that in Tocharian a *k*-aorist from the root *√steh₂ is reflected, and that the TA subjunctive forms lacking -*k*- "setzen den Wz.-Aor. Konj. von idg. *steh₂- fort", which would imply, of course, that at least in this one case, a PIE subjunctive had indeed turned into a subjunctive of a historical Tocharian language. Hackstein's guess that TA *teñc*, TA *te* were more archaic forms than TA *tākeñc*, TA *tāke* was later fully confirmed by the closer inspection of the philological evidence owed to Itkin, 2002, 14, but it is still possible that the forms TA *teñc*, TA *te* themselves had developed out of older forms with -*k*- (simply preserved in Tocharian B) by irregular truncation or weakening; see Peters, 2006, 334, fn. 16 (referring to TA *näm*, TA *neñc* in the respective present paradigm of the copula/verbum substantivum); Pinault, 2008, 640f. Whether one prefers to derive the PT Pt I stem *tākā- from a PIE (intransitive) *k*-aorist (absent in Greek) or a PIE (intransitive) *k*-perfect (actually attested in Greek) made from *√steh₂, it comes as a surprise that we have to do with a Pt I stem rather than with a Pt III stem. For the inflection in -*ā*-, there are various different explanations available that do not mutually exclude one another: PT *tāk- from Very Early pre-PT *(s)toh₂k- may have been blended with PT *tā- from Very Early pre-PT *(s)th₂-; stem-final *-ā- may have been taken over from PT *käkænā-, which also had the meaning 'became'; and finally one could assume hypercorrection triggered by a manifest tendency to weaken PT *-ā- to -*ä*- in the informal styles: note that at least two TA forms from our root, the 1.pl.act. Pt I *tākmäs* and the 2.sg.act. Ipv I *päṣtāk-ñi* in A 221 a 2 attest to a stem variant *tākä-, which can be analyzed as both a preserved archaism and the mere result of irregular weakening.

[*tākk-* 'überlegen (?)' listed by WTG, 246 as attested in A(Ud.) (= PK AS 6D) b 5 is a ghost root; see Couvreur, 1954, 88.]

tāks^a- '± destroy' → *täks^a-* 'id.'

^A*tāp^a-* 'essen', 'eat' (tr) (-/a/a)

       Prs — Imp —
              nt-Part —
              m-Part —
              Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub V (a) -,-, *tāpaṣ;* — Opt *tāpim,-,-;* —
              Ger II *tāpal* Abstr II *tāplune*
              Inf —
       Pt I (a) -,-, *tāp;* —
       PPt *tāppu*
       Ipv —

^A*śuw^ā*- 'eat' provides the suppletive present stem. The PPt TA *tāppu* continues *tātpu < *tātāpu < *tātāpāwä. The TB hapax *tāppoṃ* in 271 a 2 does rather not belong to this root (see below s.v. *tāpp^ā*- '?').

tāpp^ā- '?' (itr?) (-/a/-)
　　　　Prs — Imp —
　　　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　　　m-Part —
　　　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
　　　　Sub V (a) — Opt —;-,-, *tāppoṃ*
　　　　　　　Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
　　　　　　　Inf —
　　　　Pt —
　　　　PPt —
　　　　Ipv —

The hapax *tāppoṃ* in 271 a 2 is analyzed by the manuals (WTG, 246; TEB II, 197) as a cognate of ^A*tāp^ā*- 'eat'; differently, Winter, 2001, 134 = 2005, 523 ad 285 [recte 286] takes this form rather to be a grundverb formation of *täp-* 'proclaim' < *'make come forth'. Winter proposes the following translation for 271 a 2f.: *tūsa tāppoṃ saim wästi mai no nautañ empelñe arañcäntse* "if the protectors [not 'refugees'!] come forth — will then perhaps the danger to my heart disappear?". One may also speculate about a misspelling for *trāppoṃ* from *trāpp^ā*- 'trip' (though this does not make the passage much clearer).

tāw^ā?- '?' (?)
　　　　Prs — Imp —
　　　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　　　m-Part —
　　　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
　　　　Sub — Opt —
　　　　　　　Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
　　　　　　　Inf —
　　　　Pt —
　　　　PPt —
　　　　Ipv I (a) -; *ptāwas*

Unclear hapax in H 150.41 a 3: ///// *parksat ñī snai keś ptāwas* ///// "ask me [and] ... without number" (cf. Broomhead I, 262). One may think of a connection with *täp-* 'proclaim' and the occasional sound change *p > w*. On the other hand, a reading *pnāwas* is also not excluded.

tās- act. 'setzen, stellen, legen', 'put, set, place', mid. 'sich stellen', 'place
　　　　oneself', pass. 'verglichen werden', 'be compared' (tr) (x/x/x)
　　　　Prs II (x) —;-,-, *tāseṃ* | -, *taṣtar-ñ* (sic), *tāṣtär;-,-, tsentar* (sic);-,-, *tasaitär*
　　　　　　　Imp -,-, *taṣītär;-,-, taṣīyeṃtär*
　　　　　　　nt-Part *taṣṣeñca* (sic, MQ)
　　　　　　　m-Part *tasemane*

       Ger I *taṣalle/taṣṣalle* (sic) Abstr I —

Sub II (x) *tāsau,-, tāṣän-ne* (MQ);-,-, *tāseṃ* | -,-, *tāṣtär;* — Opt -,-, *tāṣi;* —
       Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
       Inf *tāsi*
    Pt I (m) *tasāmai, tasātai, tasāte;-,-, tasānte*
    Pt III (x) -,-, *tessa/tesa;-,-, tesar/tesare* | -,-, *tässāte;-,-, tässānte*
    PPt *tatāsaṣ*
    Ipv I (m) -; *pättāsat*
    Ipv III (x) *ptes/tes; ptässo* (MQ) | *ptäsar* (MQ);-

The form *tasaitär* is a present dual form, as per Schmidt, 1974, 285ff.; 1975, 287ff.; *tasemane* is attested in SHT 7, 1708 (reading: K. T. Schmidt). The PPt *tatās(aṣ)* in 108 a 2 (S) is restored, but nevertheless certain, even though the PPt is normally formed from the cognate root *tätt^ä-* 'put'. Since 108 is an eastern text, it may simply be an analogical neo-formation. What synchronically looks like a Pt I is diachronically a Pt III; see chap. Pt I 7.2.2. and Pt III 9.1.6.1.

The stem formations continue different ablaut grades: *tās-* (in the Prs II, Sub II, Pt I with PPt, Ipv I) is derived from PT *tās-* which looks like PIE *d^hh_1s-; to *tes-* as regular ablaut form of the singular active allomorph of the Pt III and Ipv III a secondary super zero-grade stem *täss-* has been formed in the active plural and middle Pt III; see Winter, 2001, 131 = 2005, 520; from there the super-zero grade *täs-* was taken over into the present stem (2.sg.mid. *taṣtar-ñ* (Š) and 3.pl.mid. *tsentar* 197 a 1 (M), if the latter really belongs here, because it is attested in unclear context; see Schmidt, 1974, 59, fn. 3); see Ringe, 1991, 111, fn. 121 and Hackstein, 1995, 62 with fn. 54, who refers to the parallel *nek-* : *näk-*. The double *-ṣṣ-* in the *nt*-Part and Ger I variant can be interpreted along the same lines as a secondary Prs VIII to *tās-*, since the Pt III *nek-* is associated with a Prs VIII. The 3.pl. Pt III *tesare* in the monastery record PK LC I, 2 has an analogical 3.pl. ending *-are*, which is a feature of the informal styles; see Schmidt, 1986, 648; Pinault, 1997c, 181; Peyrot, 2008, 134.

= ^A*tā(-s)-* act. 'setzen, legen', 'put, set, place', mid. 'sich stellen', 'place oneself' (tr) (a/x/x)
    Prs II (a) -,-, *tāṣ; tāsamäs,-, tāse* Imp *tāṣāwā,-,-;* —
       nt-Part —
       m-Part *tāsmāṃ*
       Ger I *tāṣäl* Abstr I —
       Inf *tāsy*
    Sub II (m) — Opt *tāṣimār,-, tāṣitär;* —
       Ger II — Abstr II —
    Sub V (a) — Opt -,-, *tāwiṣ;* —
       Ger II — Abstr II *tālune*
    Pt III (x) -,-, *casäs;-,-, casär* | *tse, tsāte,-;-,-, tsānt*
    PPt *to*
    Ipv III (x) *ptas;-* | *pätstsār; pätstsāc*

A 1.sg. Imp *tāṣā(wā)* has to be restored in A 164 b 6. The fragment in which
the 1.sg.mid. Opt TA *tāṣimār* is attested (listed in TG, 438 as being
unpublished) can now be identified as THT 1138 b 2; the subjunctive stem to
which this Opt belongs is, strictly speaking, ambiguous. The form TA *tso* in A
104 a 4 "ist natürlich nicht Ptz. Prt. zu *täs-* 'ponere' (= *to*)" (thus Poucha, TL,
124); see Couvreur, 1956, 79.

^A*täs-* KAUSATIVUM III 'verschaffen', 'provide' (tr) (a/-/-)

    Prs VIII (a) -,-, *tsäṣ*; — Imp —
       nt-Part —
       m-Part —
       Ger I — Abstr I —
       Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
       Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

TA *tsäṣ* in A 250 b 4 (TG, 441 does not give a meaning) is the equivalent of Skt.
dhatte śreyaḥ (= VAV 2.72): *śpālmune tsäṣ* "schafft Vorzüglichkeit"; see
Schmidt, 1987, 159f.; according to Schmidt, the meter would require a
disyllabic scansion of TA *tsäṣ* (Kölver's view, 1965, 148 that TA *tsäṣ* is a
pronominal ablative with the meaning 'daraus' is certainly wrong). The
passage of the second attestation of the same form in A 372 a 4 is not entirely
clear: //// *praṣ[ṭ]aṃ [tsä]ṣ säm saṃsā<r>ṣināṃ kārā[ś]iś* "by (this) time ... of
the Saṃsāra forest" (reading according to Couvreur, 1959, 252).

TA shows the stem variants TA *tā-* (Sub V, PPt), TA *tas-/cas-* (Pt and Ipv), TA
täs- (Pt and Ipv; kausativum), and TA *tās-*; the thematic present and
subjunctive stem based on TA *tas-* are best explained as cognates of the
respective formations from TB *tās-*, because there is no productive process to
derive an *s*-subjunctive from TA *tā-*, and a Prs VIII beside Sub V would be
very unusual. TA *täs-* is a super-zero grade built to TA *cas-* ← *d^heh₁-s-*, with
the *-s-* being already being a part of the root (Hackstein, 1995, 35 and 62 with
fn. 54 contra Schmidt, 1974, 59, fn. 3 and 1975, 289, fn. 10, and Normier, 1980,
266, fn. 62).

SEM. On the range of meaning, see Hackstein, 1995, 56ff. The TB passive
means 'be compared', whereas in TA this meaning is conveyed by a preserved
sk-stem ^A*tāsk-* (see s.v.). ETYM. All the various formations are, of course,
ultimately based on the PIE root *√d^heh₁* 'set'; see the detailed discussion in
Hackstein, 1995, 56ff. In TB, we have only sigmatic verbal stem formations,
which do not differ in meaning; therefore I posit as basic synchronic TB root
tās- with Prs II, Sub II, and Pt I, although synchronically a coexistence of Prs II
and Sub II should make us rather expect a Pt I with stem-final palatalization,
the lack of stem-final palatalization in the preterit showing that the paradigm
was not interpreted as a regular Prs II, Sub II, Pt I by the speakers of TB (i.e.,
the form was not analogically palatalized; this is also the case with the
secondary stem *wärsk-* 'smell'). Diachronically, the most elegant solution

would be to assume that the PIE root aorist *dʰeh₁- had first been turned into a Pt III, which was later turned into a (non-palatalized) Pt I, and that the thematic Prs PT *tāsæ-/tās'ä- had started out as an *s*-present built from the zero grade of the root *dʰh₁-. The stem allomorph *tā-* is not the continuant of an *s*-less zero-grade *dʰh₁-, but rather of a reduplicated PT *tätā- (→ TB *tättᵃ-*; see below) from PIE *dʰi/e-dʰ(o)h₁-; see Hackstein, 1995, 63, fn. 57, and Adams, DoT, 284.

tāsk?- '± drauftreten', '± tread on' (?) (—)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub ? — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf *tāṣṣatsi* (MQ)
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

Hapax in 365 a 4, the exact meaning remains unclear; on the passage see WTG, 138, § 129, fn. 7. Krause, l.c., further analyzes the form as Sub V, but Adams, 1993b, 37f. correctly points out that the palatal stem-final -*ṣṣ*- militates against such an assumption; to be sure, *ā*-vocalism in the root does point to a root with A-character (via *ā*-umlaut), although there are some roots with root vowel -*ā*- not showing A-character. Adams, l.c., on the other hand, does not want to analyze the form as belonging to a Sub II, because he would rather expect an Inf †*tāṣṣtsi*. Therefore, he assumes analogy to a palatalized Pt I like *paṣṣā-* from *pāsk-* 'protect'. And although there are thematic (and athematic Class I) forms attested that lack syncope of the suffix -*ä*- (like Inf *melyatsi*), such an Inf *tāṣṣätsi* should be written †*tāṣṣätsi* because 365 is an MQ text in (late) common archaic ductus, and in these texts the rendering of accented /ä/ by ⟨a⟩ is still very uncommon (cf. Peyrot, 2008, 34f.). Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from a PIE *-sk̂e/o- present from PIE *√steh₂ 'put, place', as per Adams, 1993b, 38, although instead of *steh₂-sk̂e/o-, one should better set up a zero-grade *(s)th₂-sk̂e/o-. This etymology is to be preferred for semantic reasons ('± tread on' ← 'place oneself') to the alternative etymology PIE *dʰh₁-sk̂e/o- which means 'place (something else)'.

ᴬtāsk- 'gleichen', 'resemble' (itr) (—)

    Prs II — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *tāskmāṃ*
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —

Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

We have to do with a lexicalized *m*-Part TA *tāskmāṃ* 'resembling'; see Hackstein, 1995, 187ff. Etym. According to Hackstein, 1995, 187ff., we have here an A-character stem TA *tāskā-* from *√dʰeh₁ 'put, set', which he sets up in order to explain the fact that a TA *-sk-* has been preserved and not been turned into TA *-s-* as is usual. However, one could also assume that we are faced with an *m*-Part from the Prs (of) *tās-* which got lexicalized at a time when in Tocharian A *s-* and *sk-*presents were about to fall together, so that from any old *s*-present forms with *-sk-* could be built; note that middle forms of the TB present stem *tās-* can indeed denote 'be compared' (on TA *-sk-* vs. TA *-s-*, see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.3.).

täk- 'berühren, ergreifen', 'touch' (tr) (a/a/a)
  Prs II (a) -,-, *ceśäṃ*;-,-, *ceken-ne* Imp —
    nt-Part *ceśemñca*
    m-Part —
    Ger I *ceśale* Abstr I —
  Sub I (a) -,-, *tekäṃ-me*;— Opt *taśim*,-, *taśi*;-,-, *taśyeṃ*
    Ger II — Abstr II *takälñe* Priv —
    Inf —
  Pt III (a) -,-, *teksa*;—
  PPt *tetekuwa* | in *tetekor* / in *tetkorsa*
  Ipv —

Instead of a 1.sg. Sub *teku-me* of this root one rather has to read *neku-me* 'I will destroy them' in 542 a 1, as per Schmidt, 1984, 150f. and 1985, 430f., since the form translates Skt. *(utsā)dayiṣyāmi* 'I want to destroy them' (the restoration is certain; see Waldschmidt, 1955, 16 = 1967, 253 with fn. 110 contra TochSprR(B)). The Abstr *takälñe* is mostly attested in MQ texts (e.g., in THT 1537 frg. c a 2), but also four times in texts from the London collection, which do not seem to have MQ character: *t(a)kälyñenta* in IOL Toch 372 a 1 and *takälyñeṣṣe* in line a 2; *takälñe* in IOL Toch 491 b 4 and IOL Toch 737 a 2; see Peyrot, 2007, s.v.; accordingly, we are dealing with a subjunctive stem with initial accent. On the PPt, see Peyrot, 2008, 152f.

= ᴬ*täk*ᵃ*-* 'berühren', 'touch' (tr) (a/-/-)
  Prs I/II (a) —;-,-, *ckeñc* Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
    Inf —
  Sub V — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II *tkālune*
  Pt —
  PPt —
  Ipv —

Poucha, TLT, 120 translates the verb with 'diiudicare, aestimare'; similarly TEB II, 104 'bewegen, bedenken' based on the evidence of the equation TA *tkālune* = Skt. *vicāra-* 'consideration'. However, it is possible that TA *tkālune* is not a literal translation of Skt. *vicāra-* in this passage, so that the TA form could belong to a cognate of TB *täk-* 'touch', as per Thomas, 1957, 276: A 384 b 5 *vicāra • tkālune ätsaṃ nāṃtsu* "*vicāra*. Betasten. Was für ein [Betasten] ist [das]?". TA *tkālune* in YQ 12 b 2 beyond doubt has the meaning 'touch' (see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 114ff.). On the other hand, TA *tkālluneyo* in A 397 b 2 rather belongs to *ᴬtkälⁱ?-* 'illuminate'; see s.v. From a morphological point of view, the 3.pl. Prs *ckeñc* (A 151 b 1; A 324 a 1) may be Prs II, Prs III (thus TEB II, 104), or Prs V; in any case, we are not dealing with the same formation as in the TB present stem (*cek-* < PT *t'æk- > TA *cak-*); Prs III is not very likely, because the form is active, and the palatalization speaks against a Prs V. Probably, we have to do with a Prs I or II with ablaut *cak-/*cäk-*, cf. the ablaut *tek-/*täk-* in the respective TB Sub I.

ETYM. Usually derived from PIE *√teh₂ĝ/g 'touch' (²LIV, 616f.; Lat. *tangere*, etc.; *√teh₁g would also be possible, according to M. Peters, p.c.). Ringe, 1991, 105ff. objects to the connection of the Toch. root with Go. *tekan* 'touch' by arguing (correctly) that both root initials are incompatible, but the Germanic form can be explained by analogy (see Mottausch, 1993, 156f.). The TB present stem shows PIE *ē*-lengthened grade; see Jasanoff, 1984, 67. The ablaut *e/ä* in the TB subjunctive (as well as the parallel ablaut *a/ä* probably to be reconstructed for the TA present) is analogical; see Lane, 1959, 160; Ringe, 1991, 107.

ᴬtäkwⁱ- '?' (?) (—)
    Prs V — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf *täkwātsi*
    Sub V — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *täkwālune*
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

The word separation yielding an Inf TA *täkwātsi* in A 321 a 6 is certain, but the form is still without clear context: *//// r täkwātsi osāt ////* "(s)he began to ..."; the same is true for the Abstr TA *täkwālune* in A 237, 3: *spāltäṅkāmāṃ śkaṃ tāloñcäs wrasas täkwālune*, where the meaning of *ᴬspāltk-* is also uncertain: "having concern/taking care of the miserable beings ...". Whether TA *täkwā* gained from the small fragment A 211 a 2 *//// ltäkwā ysāraśś(·) ////* can be analyzed as a preterit form of this root is entirely uncertain.

KAUSATIVUM ? '?' (—)
    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —

        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub IX (a) — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II in *täkwāṣluneyum*
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

The 3.sg. TA *täkwāṣā* in A 449 b 1 and the restored 3.pl. TA *(tä)kwāṣānt* in A 356 b 3 are analyzed as imperfects of the kausativum of this root by TG, 439; TEB II, 104. Both attestations are, however, philologically completely unclear. Of course one should not have expected preservation of A-character in forms built from a Prs VIII stem. For a possible interpretation of these forms as Pt IV forms, see the discussion in chap. Pt IV 10.1.1. The meaning of the adjective TA *sne-täkwāṣluneyum* in A 69 a 4 and b 1 is also unclear.

täks^ä- '± zerschlagen', '± destroy' (tr) (-/a/a)
    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V (a) — Opt *tāksoym*,-,-; —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt I (a) -,-, *taksā-c*; —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

On the 1.sg. Opt *tāksoym* in 85 b 1, see Schmidt, 2001, 314: "möchte ich mit … in kleine Stücke zerschlagen (?) die Falsch(heit) der Welt". Note that the form has indeed to be read *tāks-* and not †*nāks-* so that it is impossible to connect the verb with semantically similar *näk-* 'destroy'. The subjunctive stem has persistent initial accent. The 3.sg. Pt *taksā-c* is read in H 150.117 (= IOL Toch 272) b 3 by Peyrot, 2007, s.v. (contra Sieg apud Thomas, 1957, 220; Broomhead I, 269). *-ä-* is set up here as root vowel on the evidence of the TA cognate ^A*täps-*.
= ^A**täps-** 'zerschlagen', 'destroy' (tr) (—)
    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv I (a) -; *ptäpsäs*

The meaning is assured by Skt. *dhunadhvam* 'destroy!' in the Sanskrit parallel text; see Pinault, 2008, 49, who connects the root with *täks^a*- by applying what seems to have been a sound law PT *-ks- > TA -*ps*-. A TB equivalent of the TA imperative is restored by Pinault, 2008, 50 in the parallel text PK NS 38 + 37 b 4: *(ptaksa)so.*

täṅk- 'hemmen', 'hinder' (tr) (x/a/-)

       Prs II (x) —;-,-, *ceṅkeṃ* | -,-, *ceṃśtär*,— Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
       Prs VIII (a) -,-, *taṅkṣäṃ*;— Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub I (a) -,-, *teṅkäñ-c*;— Opt -,-, *tañci*;—
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv *etaṅkätte*
          Inf *taṅktsi*
       Pt III in
       PPt *täṅkuweṣ*
       Ipv —

The 3.sg.act. Sub *teṅkäñ-c* is attested in KVāc 21 a 2f. (see Schmidt, 1986, 54); a 1.sg. Imp can probably be restored in the small fragment THT 1356 frg. j a 2: *taṅkṣi(m)*. The PPt *täṅkuweṣ* is found in PK NS 45 a 2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). What looks like a 3.sg.mid. *teṅträ* could be attested in THT 1178 b 4: //// *(mā ?) yakne ñäś teṅträ* • "the manner does (not ?) hinder me"; however, a middle form of an ablauting Sub I stem should normally show the zero grade, and a reading *neṅkträ* is here also possible.

= ^A*täṅk-* 'hemmen', 'hinder' (tr) (x/a/a)

       Prs VIII (x) -,-, *täṅkäṣ*;— | -, *täṅkäṣtār*,-;-,-, *täṅksantär* Imp —
          nt-Part *täṅkṣantāñ*
          m-Part —
          Ger I *täṅkṣäl* Abstr I —
          Inf *täṅkässi*
       Sub I — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II *täṅklune* Priv *atäṅkät*
       Sub VII (a) -,-, *täṅkñäṣ*;— Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt III (a) —;-,-, *caṅkär*
       PPt —
       Ipv —

The 3.pl. Pt TA *täṅksantär* (from a fragment, as per TG, 439) is attested in THT 2037 a 2 without much context.

Eтʏм. Usually derived from PIE *√teng^h 'pull' (²LIV, 657 *√t^heng^h); see Adams, DoT, 290.

tänkw-ᵃññ- 'lieben, jd. Mitleid entgegenbringen', 'love, have compassion for'

 (tr) (a/a/-)

 Prs XII (a) — Imp -, *tänkwaññet* (sic),-; —

  nt-Part *tänwaññeñca*

  m-Part —

  Ger I — Abstr I —

 Sub XII (a) -, *tänwät* (MQ), *tänwaṃ*; — Opt —

  Ger II — Abstr II *tänkwalyñe* Priv —

  Inf *tänkwantsi*

 Pt V in

 PPt *tetanwañoṣ*

 Ipv V (a) *ptänwäññe* (MQ);-

Beside the MQ form 3.sg. *tänwäṃ*, *k*-less *tänwaṃ* is also attested in PK AS 16.5 b 4; probably isolated *ṭankwa[ṃ]* in THT 1395 frg. u a 1 is also a verbal form from this root. The PPt is found in PK AS 16.4 B a 5 (the latter and PK AS 16.5 b 4 are unpublished, readings according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

~ ᴬ*tuṅk-ⁱññ-* 'lieben, Mitleid empfinden für', 'love, have compassion for'

 (tr) (a+/-/-)

 Prs XII (a+) —;-,-, *tuṅkiññeñc* Imp -,-, *tuṅkiññā*; —

  nt-Part *tuṅkiññantāṃ*

  m-Part *tuṅkiññamāṃ*

  Ger I — Abstr I —

  Inf *tuṅkiñtsi*

 Sub XII — Opt —

  Ger II — Abstr II *tuṅkiñlune*

 Pt —

 PPt —

 Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs TA *(tuṅki)ññeñc* can be restored with certainty in A 260 b 5 + A 286 b 6; see Schmidt, 1974, 23, fn. 1. TA *tuṅkiññā* in A 311 a 1 is an imperfect not a preterit form, as per Thomas, 1957, 77, fn. 1; the same form is now also attested in YQ 5 b 4.

Sᴇᴍ. The meaning is the same as Skt. *anu* √kamp 'have compassion for'. Eᴛʏᴍ. Denominative based on *taṅkw* 'love', respectively TA *tuṅk* 'love'; see Hilmarsson, 1991a, 83f.

ᴬ*tätk-* '?' (tr) (-/-/m)

 Prs VIII — Imp —

  nt-Part —

  m-Part —

  Ger I — Abstr I —

  Inf *tätkässi*

 Sub — Opt —

  Ger II — Abstr II —

 Pt II (m) -,-, *tatätkāt*; —

PPt —
Ipv —

Schneider, 1941, 49 compares Gk. δατέομαι 'teile', etc., and states without further discussion: "Diese Bedeutung scheint zu Toch. Gr. 72 a 6 zu passen". A 72 a 6 deals with the Nigrodhamiga Jātaka (cf. Thomas, 1957, 67), where a group of gazelles decides to sacrifice one of them regularly by drawing lots in order to prevent a hunt on the whole party. Peyrot, in print, proposes to translate: "... durch (dieses Abkommen) sollt ihr versuchen, einander das Leben zu verlängern (?)". The preterit forms in A 168 a 4 and A 155 b 1 (if restored correctly) are without context.

tätt^ᵝ- act. 'setzen, legen', 'put, set, place', mid. 'sich stellen', 'place oneself'
    (tr) (-/x/-)
    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V (x) -,-, *tattaṃ;-,-, tattaṃ*|-,-, *tättātär;-,-, tättäntär*
        Opt —; -,-, *täcciyeṃ-ne* (sic) | *taccimar* (sic),-,-; —
        Ger II — Abstr II *tättālñe/t̬ättālñe* Priv —
        Inf *tättātsi-śc*
    Pt I in
    PPt *tättā͡u* | in *tättärmeṃ*
    Ipv —

The abstract variant *t̬ättālñe* is also attested in THT 1482 a 3 (Š). Note that the Sub V stem has a non-*ā*-stem athematic optative that even shows initial accent in the 1.sg.mid. SEM. The middle is either reflexive 'place oneself' or reciprocal (e.g., in 27 a 6, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 322), or has other functions typical of a middle, e.g., in 84 b 5, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 323 with fn. 1. ETYM. The root continues the reduplicated PIE present stem *$d^he/i\text{-}d^h(o/e)h_1$- from *$\sqrt{d^heh_1}$ 'put'; see Hackstein, 1995, 63 with fn. 57 (both *o*-grade and zero grade would have given a PT *ā*-stem). Hackstein claims that TB (*)*tättā*- is "urtoch. *$ttá$- mit restituierter Reduplikation" (PT *$ttā$- itself to be explained as "aus *$t\partial tá$- durch Synkope des unbetonten Reduplikationsvokals /ə/ in offener Silbe hervorgegangen", but see chap. PPt 14.2.2. According to Hackstein, l.c., and Adams, DoT, 284, the TA stem ^A*tā*- 'put' is likewise to be derived from PT *$tätā$-; see s.v. ^A*tā(-s)-*. The synchronically irregular optative stem *täcci*- continues the PIE Opt *$d^hi/e\text{-}d^hh_1\text{-}ih_1$-, as per Adams, DoT, 285. The initial accent of the 1.sg.mid. Opt *taccimar* must be analogical after other athematic optatives that are formed from Sub I stems with persistent initial accent < former reduplication with *Cä-; see chap. Imp, fn. 1. The 3.pl. Opt *tä(cc)iyeṃ-n(e)* is restored by TochSprR(B) in the Sängim text 115 (= THT 1575 frg. c), and isolated //// *t̬acciy(·)* //// in THT 1540 frg. f b 1 most likely also belongs here (M. Peyrot, p.c.).

***tän*ᵃ*-** 'überfallen', 'attack, set upon' (?) (—)

   Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt I in
   PPt *tnauwa*
   Ipv —

Clear hapax in THT 1539 frg. b b 3: //// *wārṣṣeṃtsa tnauwa* //// "[Frauen sind] von Räubern überfallen [worden]"; see Schmidt, 2006, 465, with fn. 49. D. Q. Adams (p.c.) points out to me that *tan[ā]lle* in W 13 a 2 (see Adams, DoT, 278; not in WTG) may belong here as well (pace Filliozat, 1948, 69, the second vowel can be read *[ā]*): //// *traiwo tan[ā]lle* //// "the mixture ..." (such a writing *ta* for *tä* would have parallels in the Weber manuscript). In this case one would, of course, have to reckon with a metaphorical use, according to Adams (p.c.) perhaps "to indicate the initiation of vigorous activity", i.e., "to be beaten vigorously" vel sim. On the other hand, if taken at face value *tanālle* may also belong to an otherwise unattested root *tān*ᵃ*-*.

täṃts- '?' (tr) (a/a/-)

   Prs IXb (a) -,-, *taṃtsäṣṣäṃ;* — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub IXb (a) -,-, *taṃtsäṣṣäṃ;-,-, taṃsäskeṃ* Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —

3.sg. *taṃtsäṣṣäṃ* in 331 a 1 is a subjunctive, not a present (pace WTG, 246). SEM. The meaning of the root is unclear; see the discussion by Winter, 2003a, 110 = 2005, 532. However, since the objects of the verbal forms are always plants, one may rather think of a meaning 'abreißen, pflücken' (thus TochSprR(B), glossary, 125), or 'ausstreuen' (thus WTG, 246, followed by most authors and in consistence with the Old Turkish gloss in 331 a 1, on which see most recently Maue, 2009, 23), than of the more general meaning 'cause a downward movement' advocated by Winter, l.c. ETYM. Hackstein, 2001, 19 and 2003, 183, who takes it to mean 'zer-, verstreuen', assumes a connection with Lat. *tundere*, i.e., a nasal present from PIE *√(s)teu̯d 'stoßen' (²LIV, 601 without Toch.).

täp- 'verkünden', 'proclaim' (tr) (m/-/a)

        Prs IX (m) -,-, *tpästär*; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt IV (a) -,-, *tapäṣṣa*; —
        PPt —
        Ipv II (a) *päccapa*; —

Judging by the averbo, *tpästär* should be a kausativum, i.e., a Prs IXb form, but the syncope of what then should be an accented root vowel is odd, the more in the attestation in the prose text H 149.add 8 b 2 (no MQ character), which deals with Pārājika 1 (see Pinault, 1988, 163, fn. 77); the second attestation comes from the metrical MQ text 230. The hapax *tāppoṃ* is analyzed by Winter, 2001, 134 = 2005, 523 ad 285 [recte 286] as a form of the grundverb of this root, but this remains uncertain; see above s.v. *tāpp^a^-* '?'.

= ^A^*täp-* 'verkünden', 'proclaim' (tr) (—)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *tpässi*
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II in
        PPt *cacpu*
        Ipv —

The Ipv TA *ptäpsäs* in A 354 b 5 (Prātimokṣasūtra) does not belong to this root, but is hapax of a root ^A^*täps-* 'destroy', the TA cognate of *täks-* 'id.'; see s.v.

^A^*täp^a^-* '?' (itr) (m/-/-)

        Prs III (m) -,-, *tpatär*; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I in
        PPt *tpo*
        Ipv —

TG, 446 proposes TA *tpatär* as alternative reading for TA *npatär* in A 115 a 4 (*t* and *n* as first part of a ligature akṣara are almost indistinguishable in TA

manuscripts). In theory, TA *tpa-* may be interpreted as corresponding intransitive grundverb form of *ᴬtäpᵃ-* '± be noticed' being a kausativum of *ᴬtäp-* 'proclaim'. The passage A 115 a 4 *käryāñ pränki-ñi tpatär ñy oki ni ////* can in this case be translated: "my thoughts are restraining me, like he/she/it is making him/her/itself noticed ...". As an alternative, the form may belong to the grundverb '± be destroyed' of the same root the Ipv TA *ptäpsäs* 'destroy' in A 354 b 5 is made from (see s.v. *ᴬtäp-* 'proclaim'). The contexts of the PPt TA *tpont* attested in A 148 a 5 (as read by TochSprR(A)) and A 148 b 2 (read *npont* by TochSprR(A); but see TG, 439), are too fragmentary to decide the question with certainty. TG connects the PPt with the adverb TA *tpär* 'high', and this view is followed by Winter, 1988, 781 = 2005, 335. Winter further adds here the second member of compound TA *°tpānt* that, in his opinion, is to be read in A 379 b 4: TA *koṃ[tp]ānt* 'south'. In contrast, Pinault, 1998a, 363f. argues that the compound in A 379 b 4 should rather be interpreted as designating 'west' and that is has to be read TA *koṃ[yp]ānt*, a reading supported by Carling, DThTA, s.v. *koṃ-ypānt*.

ᴬtäps- 'destroy' → *täks-* 'id.'

täm- 'geboren werden, entstehen', 'be born, come into being' (itr) (m+/m/m)
        Prs Xa (m+) -, *tänmastär* (sic), *tänmastär;-,-, tänmaskentär* Imp —
            nt-Part *tänmaṣṣeñca*
            m-Part *tänmaskemane*
            Ger I *tänmaṣṣälle* Abstr I —
        Sub III (m) *cmemar, cmetar, cmetär;-,-, cmentär*
            Opt *cmīmar,-, cmītär;* —
            Ger II *cmelle* Abstr II *cmelñe/cmelläññe* Priv —
            Inf *cmetsi*
        Pt III (m) *temtsamai, temtsātai* (MQ), *temtsate; temtsamte,-, temtsante*
        PPt *tetemu | tetemoṣ*
        Ipv —
The nt-Part *tänmaṣṣeñca* is to be read in K 2 (= PK AS 7B) b 1, according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c., contra Lévi, 1933. The Ger forms *cmäl[l](le)* in 146 b 6 (MQ) and *cmalye* in 424 a 3 (M) are correctly listed by Adams, DoT, 292 as forms of this root (not in WTG, 247); on both forms, see in detail Malzahn, in print b. A Pt *temtsamai* is also found in PK AS 13C a 2 (Couvreur, 1954, 89), the 2.sg. Pt *temtsātai* in the MQ text THT 1540 frg. c a 3 (Schmidt, 2007, 329).
Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'gebären, erzeugen, hervorrufen', 'beget, generate' (tr) (x/m/-)
        Prs Xb (x) *tanmäskau, tanmäst, tanmäṣṣäṃ;-,-, tanmäskeṃ |*
            -,-, tanmästär; —
            Imp —
            nt-Part *tanmäṣṣeñca*
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub Xb (m) — Opt -,-, *tanmaṣṣitär* (sic); —
            Ger II *täṃmäṣle* (MQ) Abstr II — Priv —

Inf *tanmästsi*

Pt IV in
PPt *tetanmäṣṣuwa*
Ipv —

A 1.sg. *tanmäskau* is only listed apud TochSprR(B), glossary, 127 without ref. The 2.sg. Prs *tanmäst* is attested in the fragment H add.149.01 b 1 (cf. Broomhead I, 260, without translation): //// *ttñ(·) sak palskone tanmäst ṣek mäkcau mäkc[au]* "... you always produce happiness in the spirit which ..."; the 3.sg. Opt *(ta)[nma]ṣṣitär* is found in PK NS 13 + 516 b 5 (Couvreur, 1967, 154). The Ger *tämmäṣle* in 142 b 3 is to be analyzed as (substantivized) Ger I, as per Thomas, 1952, 58 with fn. 3.

= ᴬ*täm-* 'geboren werden, entstehen', 'be born, come into being' (itr) (m/m/m)

Prs X (m) -,-, *tämnäṣtär;-,-, tmäṃsaṃtär* Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part *tmäṃsamāṃ*
Ger I *tmäṃṣäl* Abstr I —
Inf *tämnässi*
Sub III (m) -,-, *cmatär;—* Opt *cmīmār,-,-; cmimtär,-,-*
Ger II *cmal* Abstr II *cmalune*
Pt 0 (m) -,-, *tamät;-,-, tamänt*
PPt *tatmu*
Ipv —

A 3.pl. Prs TA *tmäṃsaṃtär* is also attested in THT 1139 a 4 and THT 2466 b 2.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'gebären, erzeugen, hervorrufen', 'beget, generate' (tr) (a/m/m)

Prs X (a) -,-, *tämnäṣ;—* Imp —
nt-Part *tmäṃṣant*
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Inf *tämnässi*
Sub IX (m) — Opt -,-, *tmāṣitär;—*
Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt IV (m) —;-,-, *tatämṣānt*
PPt *tatämṣu*
Ipv —

Eᴛʏᴍ. Maybe from PIE *√tem 'erreichen' (²LIV, 624), rather than from PIE *√temh₁ 'cut' (see the ref. in Adams, DoT, 292f.). Winter, 1962a, 27 = 1984, 269 = 2005, 57 proposes a root PIE *√dʰem 'make' thought to be a variant of PIE *√dʰeh₁ 'put, place', in the same way as PIE *√gʷem 'go' seems to be one of PIE *√gʷeh₂ 'id.' (see also s.v. *stäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'stand', and note that *täm-* could also simply be an *s*-less variant of that same root *stäm⁽ᵃ⁾-*).

According to Schmidt, 1997, 252f., an apparently homonymous root *täm-* is attested by the Ger *tämṣale* in the unpublished Berlin text 3009, 3+4 b 4 (now = THT 2347, uppermost fragment; the form is, according to Schmidt, also to be restored in line a 4), which Schmidt wants to translate by '(ein-)tauchen', but this is most uncertain.

tär- '± trösten, beruhigen', '± comfort, soothe' (tr) (—)

      Prs Xa — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *tärraskemane*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —

The traditional interpretation of this hapax in 85 a 3 as a Prs Xa from a root *tär-* is the most plausible solution for morphological reasons. According to Schmidt, 2001, 314, the *m*-Part means 'beruhigend' (followed by Winter, 2001, 134 = 2005, 523 ad 293 'comforting, soothing'); differently TEB II, 198 and Adams, DoT, 293. The same form is probably attested in the small fragment THT 1602 frg. b a 4 without context (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.).

^A*tär-* → ^A*trus-* 'tear to pieces'

tär^{B?}- '± (aus)dehnen', '± stretch, reach out' (itr) (-/-/a)

      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt I (a) —;-,-, *cirār* (sic)
      PPt —
      Ipv —

The 3.pl. Pt *cirār* is a hapax in PK NS 38 + 37 a 1 (see Pinault, 1988a, 194f.): *po klokastanmeṃ cir(ā)r kälymi(ṃ)* "A partir de tous les pores, des rayons traversèrent les directions". Pinault, 1988a, 200f. plausibly derives the root from PIE *√terh₂ 'durchkommen, überqueren' (²LIV, 633f. without this Toch. form). On the ending *-ār* instead of *-āre*, see chap. Pt I 7.2.7.

tärk- '± umwinden', '± twine (around)' (tr) (—)

      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt III in

PPt *tetarkuwa/* in *tetärkuwermeṃ*

Ipv —

In contrast to the manuals (e.g., WTG, 183, § 177, fn. 1), Hilmarsson, 1991, 140f. argues that *tetarkuwa* belongs to a kausativum of *tärk^a-* 'dismiss, emit'. The passage *oppīloṃ tetarkuwa* in the bilingual text 542 a 4 is the equivalent of Skt. *pari* √kṣip 'entwist' and refers to *pässaksa* 'garlands' (on the passage, see also Saito, 2006, 469). The Skt. root √kṣip 'throw' and the Toch. grundverb 'emit' are indeed not too distant semantically. However, since all roots beginning with *tä-* show palatalization in the PPt made to a Pt II stem, the PPt rather belongs to a Pt III, and Pt III is not a likely candidate in a kausativum paradigm. In addition, such a Pt III from a root *^{A}tärk-* also seems attested in TA. According to Peyrot, 2007a, 800, one furthermore has to read and restore *(t)[e]tärkuwermeṃ* in 617 b 5 (without clear context).

~ *^{A}tärk-* '± (die Besinnung) verlieren', '± lose (one's consciousness)' (tr) (-/-/III)

    Prs — Imp —

        nt-Part —

        m-Part —

        Ger I — Abstr I —

        Inf —

    Sub — Opt —

        Ger II — Abstr II —

    Pt III (a) —;-,-, *crakär*

    PPt —

    Ipv —

The Pt III TA *crakär* in A 395 a 4 is analyzed as a form of *^{A}tärk^a-* 'emit' by the manuals, but this would not fit morpho(no)logically at all. Therefore, I set up a separate, A-characterless root *^{A}tärk-* that may be cognate to similarly A-characterless TB *tärk-*, even though this cannot be proven semantically. The collocation TA *ime crakär* in A 395 a 4 seems to have the meaning "sie verloren das Bewußtsein"; see Schmidt, 1974, 124f. Note that the root 'twine' is beyond doubt attested in TA in the noun *tark* 'earring', cf. Adams, DoT, 295. One may start with a basic meaning 'twine around (one's mind)' → '± lose (one's consciousness)'. On the possible PPt TA *tatärkuṣ* see s.v. *^{A}tärk^a-* 'emit'. ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√terk^u 'sich drehen' (^{2}LIV, 635). Adams, DoT, 295 connects the nom. agentis *tarkāttsa* 'carpenter' presupposing a Sub V stem. However, *tärk-* 'twist' is rather expected to have non-A-character in contrast to *tärk^a-* 'emit', and since 'twist' does not mirror carpentry work too accurately, I prefer to set up a different, otherwise unattested root *tārk^a-* '± do carpentry' for the nom. ag.

tärk^a- 'entlassen, rauslassen', 'dismiss, emit' (tr) (x/a/x)

    Prs VI (x) *tärkanau-c*, *tärkanat*, *tärkanaṃ/tärknaṃ-ne/tärknaṃ*;

        tärkanam, *tärkanacer*, *tärkanaṃ/tärknaṃ* |

        -,-, *tärkanatär*;-,-, *tärkänantär* (MQ)

        Imp *tarkanoym* (Š),-, *tärkänoy* (MQ); —

        nt-Part —

       m-Part *tärknāmane* (MQ)
       Ger I *tärkanalle/tärknalle* Abstr I —
    Sub V (a) *tārkau,-, tārkaṃ; tarkam, tarkacer,-*
       Opt *tarkoym, tärkoyt* (MQ), *tarkoy;-,-, tarko-ñ*
       Ger II *tärkalye* (MQ)/*tarkallona* Abstr II *tarkalyñe* Priv —
       Inf *tarkatsi/tārkatsi* (Š)
    Pt I (x) *cärkāwa, cärkāsta, carka;-,-, cärkāre|-,-, tärkāte;-,-, tärkānte*
    PPt *tärkau/tärko ̓ᵤ* (MQ)/*tärkauw* (MQ)| *tärkoṣ*
    Ipv I (a) *ptārka/tārka; ptarkaso*

The 2.sg. Prs *tärkanat* is often attested in caravan travel passes, the 3.sg.mid. Prs *tärkana[tä]r* is found in SHT 8, 1868 (reading: K. T. Schmidt), and the 3.pl.mid. Prs in THT 1859 b [recte a] 1 (MQ): *cowai ṭạṛ̣ḳạnantṛạ ////. tarknaṃ* in the small fragment 147 frg. a b 3 is without much value. I cannot find *tärknān-ne* mentioned in Thomas, 1979, 169 as being attested in an unpubl. Berlin text. A 2.sg. Opt *(tä)rkoyt* is to be restored in THT 1540 frg. a + b a 5; see Schmidt, 2007, 325. The subjunctive stem shows ablaut and persistent initial accent (text H 149.37, where the Ger *tärkalye* is attested, has MQ character). Sieg/Siegling list a form *cärkāt* in TochSprR(B), glossary, 127, which they analyze as a preterit, but this cannot be a correct TB Pt form and is maybe simply a typo. An Ipv *ptārka-ñ* is also attested in THT 1295 a 1: *ptārka-ñ ponta ṭṛạṅkonta* "erlaß mir alle Sünden!" (thus the translation by Thomas, 1997, 83, without text ref.); an MQ variant 2.pl. Ipv *ptärkaso-me* is further found in THT 1228 b 1. The oblique PPt *tärkoṣ* is, e.g., attested in 217 b 1.

= ᴬ***tärkᵃ-*** 'entlassen, rauslassen', 'dismiss, emit' (tr) (x/a/a)

    Prs VI (x) *-,-, tärnāṣ;-,-, tärneñc* Imp *— ;-,-, cārkar|-,-, cārkat;* —
       nt-Part —
       m-Part *tärnāmāṃ*
       Ger I *tärnāl* Abstr I —
       Inf —
    Sub V (a) *tarkam,-, tarkaṣ;-, tärkāc, tärkeñc* Opt —
       Ger II *tärkāl* Abstr II *tärkālune*
    Pt I (a) *-,-, cärk;-,-, tarkar*
    PPt *tärko*
    Ipv I (a) *ptark; ptärkäs*

The subjunctive forms TA *tarkaṣ* and TA *tärkeñc* are only listed in TEB I, 228, § 412,2, and TEB II, 105 without ref. The manuals analyze the Pt III TA *crakär* in A 395 a 4 as a kausativum form of this root, but this is not likely from a morphological point of view. For this form, see s.v. ᴬ*tärk-* '± lose (one's consciousness)'. The nom.pl. masc. PPt TA *tatärkuṣ* attested without much context in the medical/magical text PK NS 4 b 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; also listed by Couvreur, 1956, 98 without ref.) nevertheless rather belongs to a kausativum of this stems than to ᴬ*tärk-* '± lose (one's consciousness)'. The text treats dream oracles: *//// k(··) tatärkuṣ cwaṃ ce* "(if) these ... are made emitted on you".

Sᴇᴍ. The middle form *mā tärkana[tä]r* attested in SHT 8, 1868 is passive, as per K. T. Schmidt apud SHT 8, 1868, fn. 4: "(ein Wort oder ähnliches) wird nicht entlassen, geäußert". The Prs TA *cārkat* is a reciprocal middle (see Schmidt, 1974, 319). Eᴛʏᴍ. Usually seen as a cognate of Hitt. *tarna-* 'let in' and derived from PIE *√TerKh₂ 'lassen' (²LIV, 635); for Hittite see now Kloekhorst, 2008, 847 (who rather sets up PIE *√terKh₁ₐ). Differently, Schmidt, 1988, 476ff. and 1992, 104f. (but on the problematic sound change *h₂ > Toch. *k* set up by Schmidt, see chap. *tk*-Roots, fn. 1).

ᴬ*tärm-* 'zittern, erregt sein', 'tremble, be agitated' (itr) (a+/-/-)

    Prs I (a+) -,-, *trämäṣ;-,-, tärmiñc* Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *tärmmāṃ*
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

Verbal forms are only attested in TA, but cf. TB *tremi* 'anger'. Sieg, 1943, 137 proposes the meaning 'in Zorn geraten' for the root. Eᴛʏᴍ. PIE *√trem 'zittern' (²LIV, 648f.).

täl⁽ᵃ⁾- '(er)tragen', 'carry, bear' (tr) (x/-/-)

    Prs VI (x) -,-, *tällaṃ* (MQ);-,-, *tallaṃ/tällān-ne* (MQ)
        | -,-, *tlanatär-ñ;-,-, tlanantär-ñ* Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I *tällālle* Abstr I —
    Sub I(?) — Opt —
        Ger II *tälle* (sic, MQ) Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf *tällätsi* (MQ)
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv VI (a) *ptälle-ñ* (MQ);-

The Ger I *tällālle* is attested in PK AS 6A b 2, the Ipv *ptälle-ñ* in PK AS 12D a 5 (MQ), and an Inf *tällätsi* in PK AS 12D b 4 (MQ) (all unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The Ger II *tälle* 'burden' (only MQ) was said to derive from a Sub V form *tälälle by WTG, 138, § 129, Anm. 1, but the MQ Inf *tällätsi* can neither be a Sub V nor a Sub VI form, because in MQ texts /ā/ is precisely not rendered by ⟨ä⟩. However, it may be a mere error for the Sub IXb Inf *tälästsi*. If we indeed have to do with a Sub I, Ipv *ptälle-ñ* then would be another case of an imperative in *-e* standing beside both a verbal stem in PT *-ā- and a verbal stem in PT *-ä- (see chap. Ipv 37.8.). Whether *[t]lava* in 584 a 9 (MQ) is to be analyzed as a 1.sg. Pt of this root remains unclear since the

form is without context (at least the reading with initial *t* is certain, and a writing ⟨v⟩ for ⟨w⟩ is indeed attested a couple of times). As for an alleged Pt *tläwa* said to be attested in PK NS 252 a 3 by Saito, 2006, 404, according to G.-J. Pinault (p.c.) such a form cannot be found in either PK NS 252 or PK NS 252a. K. T. Schmidt apud Saito, 2006, 403 with fn. 27 further adduces a restored PPt *(tä)llowa* from a text cited as "8871.4", but I cannot find such a text/signature in the Berlin or in the Paris collection.

Kausativum III '(auf)heben, (er)tragen', 'lift up, carry' (tr) (x/a/x)

    Prs IXb (x) *taläskau*,-, *taläṣṣäṃ*;-,-, *taläskeṃ* | -,-, *tällästär* (MQ);—

        Imp *taläṣṣim*,-, *taläṣṣī-ne*;—

        nt-Part *taläṣṣeñca*

        m-Part —

        Ger I — Abstr I —

    Sub IXb (a) -,-, *taläṣṣäṃ*;— Opt -,-, *tälaṣṣi* (MQ);—

        Ger II *taläṣṣälonasa* Abstr II — Priv —

        Inf *talästsi*

    Pt II (x) *cālawa*,-, *cāla*;— | -,-, *cālate*;—

    PPt *ceclu* | in *ceccalorsa*

    Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs *taläskeṃ* is attested in PK AS 7K a 2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the Ger II *taläṣṣä[l]o[nasa]* (fem.pl. perlative) in SHT 7, 1621 (reading: K. T. Schmidt), the Inf *talästsi* in IOL Toch 724 a 1 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.), and the 3.sg.mid. Pt *cālate* in THT 3597 b 4 (MQ): *sayusā ceṃ cālate* "ein Adler (?) ergriff sie (scil. die Affenjungen)" (cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 276; *sayusā* is an unclear hapax); the reading of an active form *cāla-ne* 'grabbed him' can safely be excluded. The nt-Part *taläṣṣeñca* is read in 107 a 4 (contra the manuals) by Schmidt, 2008a, 316 with fn. 18 and Pinault, 2008, 114 and 128.

= ᴬ*täl(ä)*- '(auf)heben', 'lift up' (tr) (—)

    Prs — Imp —

        nt-Part —

        m-Part —

        Ger I — Abstr I —

        Inf —

    Sub V — Opt —

        Ger II — Abstr II *tlālune*

    Pt —

    PPt —

    Ipv —

The Abstr TA *tlā(luneyo)* is to be restored with certainty in YQ 2 a 2f.; despite the existence of a Sanskrit parallel version, it remains uncertain which stem formation of this root is to be restored in TA *(–)lyāṃ* in A 244 b 4 (cf. Hackstein, 1995, 34). Note that it cannot be excluded that the Sub stem is of Class VI (*tällālune > TA *tlālune* by degemination).

Kausativum III '(auf)heben, (er)tragen', 'lift up, raise, bear' (tr) (m/-/a)

    Prs VIII (m) -,-, *tläṣtär*;— Imp —

               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I — Abstr I —
               Inf *tlässi*
      Sub — Opt —
               Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt II (a) -,-, *cacäl;—*
      PPt *caclu*
      Ipv —
SEM. The manuals do not mention any difference in meaning between grundverb and kausativum, but such a difference exists, as already implicitly stated by Adams, DoT, 296; to put it more explicitly, the TB grundverb has always the durative meaning 'carry a burden' (in a figura etymologica with *tälle* 'burden, load' in 389 b 4, 514 a 9, and PK AS 12D a 5), and it is also used metaphorically. This durative meaning is also attested with forms of the TB kausativum (401 b 5; maybe also in 459, 7). In contrast to the TB grundverb, the TB kausativum (esp. the *sk*-forms) can in addition have terminative semantics: 'lift up' ('a jewel' in 337 a 1, cf. the Sanskrit parallel Pāt 58; 'a pot of porridge' in 107 a 7) and 'raise' (e.g., 'the head' in 407 b 1). The TA kausativum likewise means both 'carry' and 'lift' (cf. TG, 440). Whether the middle forms of the present stem in TA are passives is unclear due to the lack of context. ETYM. PIE *√telh$_2$ 'aufheben, auf sich nehmen' (²LIV, 622ff.); see Adams, DoT, 297.

tälp⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich reinigen', 'be purged' (itr) (—)
      Prs V — Imp —
               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I *tälpālle* Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
               Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
               Inf —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —
The (substantivized) gerundive is made from the present stem, i.e., is a Ger I (not II, as per WTG, 249), according to Thomas, 1952, 56: Fill. St. b 4 *tälpāllesa yamaṣle* "(es ist) zum Purgieren zu gebrauchen", and Fill. Y 2 a 1f. *tälpāllesa aiṣle* "(ist) zum Purgieren zu geben".
ANTIGRUNDVERB 'reinigen', 'purge' (tr) (—)
      Prs — Imp —
               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub I/II — Opt —
               Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

Inf *talptsi*

Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The subjunctive class of the Inf *talptsi* is ambiguous (Sub I is set up by Kümmel, ²LIV, 623), and both Sub I and Sub II are a possible subjunctive stem of an antigrundverb paradigm. Pace the handbooks, there is no (Kaus. II) Prs IXb *nt*-Part attested in 107 a 4, because the form in question has to be read *taläṣṣeñca* (Schmidt, 2008a, 316 with fn. 18 and Pinault, 2008, 114 and 128). SEM. Strictly speaking, the valency is not determinable, because there are only non-finite forms attested; nevertheless, the semantics and morphology of the forms rather point to the triple paradigm given here. ETYM. Adams, DoT, 297 derives the root from PIE *√telp 'Raum schaffen' (²LIV, 623).

täs- 'put, set, place' → *tās-* 'id.'

^A*täs-* 'put, set, place' → ^A*tā(-s)-* 'id.'

*tin*ᵃ*-* '± sich besudeln', '± defile oneself' (?) (a/m/-)

Prs IX (a) — Imp -,-, *tinaṣṣi* (sic); —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub V (m) —;-,-, *tinäntär* Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
Pt ? —
PPt in *tettinor*
Ipv —

The meaning 'beschmutzt sein' is assumed with question mark by WTG, 249. The meaning '± filth' of the abstract *tettinor* in 522 a 5 (Š) is plausible: *tettinor śuwaṃ* //// "they eat filth"; see the partial translation of this manuscript by Couvreur, 1954a, 112. *tinaṣṣi* is attested in a small fragment edited sub 374 (Qu): //// *brāhmapna* (sic) *tinaṣṣi* • "(s)he defiled her/himself with brahman (?) ..."; the subjunctive is attested in 408 b 6 (S): *k̮se cai tallāñc tinänträ tot laukaññe* "which miserable ones defile themselves for such a long time" (the verbal form could also be read *ninänträ*, but there is no root *nin-* attested so far). WTG, 249 analyzes *tinaṣṣi* as imperfect of a present stem of Class IXa, i.e., a non-kausativum, and this is indeed the most likely analysis. Since the context is fragmentary, it cannot be excluded that *tinaṣṣi* is transitive, and the intransitivity of the Sub form due to its middle diathesis, because if the root were basically intransitive, both active and middle inflection would be unusual. The PPt (as presupposed by the abstract) at first glance seems to belong to a Pt III, but the coexistence of a Pt III with a Sub V is highly unusual. Consequently, the Pt III may belong to an antigrundverb paradigm (or even to a Subclass 7 Pt I).

tu- 'shine' → *tw^a̯-* 'id.'

tuk^(a̯)- 'sich verbergen, Zuflucht nehmen', 'hide oneself, seek refuge in'
       (itr) (m/a/-)
       Prs II/III (m) *cukemar*,-,-; — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub V (a) *taukau-c*,-,-; — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
       Pt I in
       PPt *tukau*
       Ipv —

The 1.sg. Prs *cukemar* means 'I seek refuge in', as per Schmidt, 1974, 107: 268 b 2 *saim wästa tañ painene cukemar* "O Schutz [und] Zuflucht, zu (?) deinen Füssen bin ich geborgen". From a formal point of view, it can be analyzed as a present of Class II or Class III. Judging by its valency, Prs III seems more likely, but if *taukau-c* in H 149.26/30 b 2 is indeed to be analyzed as a form of this root (thus Adams, 1993b, 39; 1994b, 311 with fn. 3, and DoT 299), Prs II would be more regular; the traditional view on *taukau-c* is that the form either belongs to a root variant *tauk-* from *śauk-* 'call' (thus WTG, 250), or is merely a misspelling for *śaukau-c* (thus Schmidt, 1974, 95, fn. 2). Admittedly, the meaning 'call' goes well with the passage in question, but so does 'seek refuge in' (cf. Pinault, 2008, 323). The same form is usually restored in line a 6 of the same text (see Broomhead, l.c., and Schmidt, 1974, 95f. with fn. 2): H 149.26/30 a 6 *karuṇīk=añmālaṣ(ka t)au[k]o[c]ₗ k[w]ām(a)r[c]ₗ*, which is translated by Schmidt: "O Barmherziger, Mitleidiger! Ich schreie [und] rufe dich". But since *kwāmarc* is a present form, we would expect the parallel verbal form to be a present stem formation as well, which is somehow problematic in view of the existence of another present stem with PT *-'äw- attested by *cukemar*. But since the beginning of the verbal form in line a 6 is damaged, we may be dealing with *(ś)auko-c* in the first place (see s.v. *kauk-* 'call'). Carling, 2000, 344 proposes a complete restoration of an Ipv 2.pl. *(ptukas)* in 46 b 4. Beside the fem. pl. PPt *tukowa* in 283 b 2, the masc. nom.sg. *tukau* is now attested in THT 3597 (MQ = Mainz 655, 1) b 5 (cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 274).

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'verbergen', 'hide' (tr) (m/-/m)
       Prs IXb (m) *tūkäskemar*,-, *tukästär* (MQ);-,-, *tukäskentär* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *tukäskemane*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —

Pt II (m) *caukamai,-, caukate;-,-, caukante*
PPt *ceccuku | ceccukoṣ*
Ipv II (a) *päccauk;-*

The 1.sg. Prs *mā tūkaskemar*\ is attested in a text kept by the Regional Museum of the Province of Xinjiang in Ürümqi (inventory number 58 K.K. 18: 2.1/8 a 5, unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The endingless Ipv *paccauk*ă\ is attested on the otherwise blank verso side of the monastery record PK Cp 34 (Couvreur, 1954, 89; Pinault, 1994b, 91). The kausativum means 'hide something (in a concrete sense)' or 'conceal (a meaning, vel sim.)'; see Schmidt, 1974, 402. TochSprR(B) restores *(tu)käskeṃ* in 578 a 4 (M). The PPt *ceccukoṣ* is attested in PK NS 306+305 a 4 (Couvreur, 1970, 177) and PK AS 16.3 a 2 (Pinault, 1989a, 156).

= ᴬ*tpuk*⁽ª⁾- '± verbergen, verborgen sein', '± hide' (?) (m/-/-)

        Prs VI (m) — Imp — ;-,-, *tpukñānt*
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

TG, 441 analyzes TA *tpukñānt* in A 401 b 1 as 3.pl.mid. Imp form of the grundverb; differently, TEB I, 220, § 398,2 proposes a derivation from a (probably "kausativum") subjunctive stem, but all supposed instances of imperfects built from subjunctive stems are very doubtful, and TA *tpukñānt* would in any case be a regular 3.pl.mid. Imp of a Prs VI stem (cf., e.g., TA *kropñānt*). The valency and exact meaning cannot be determined, because the form is without context.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ ? 'verbergen', 'hide' (tr) (—)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *tpukässi*
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II in
        PPt *cacpuku*
        Ipv —

Eᴛʏᴍ. According to Adams, 1993b, 39; 1994b, 311f., and DoT, 300 to be derived from PT *(wä-)täwk-, with TA showing the prefixed variant PT *wä-täwk- with pre-TA *wt- > TA *tp-. Adams further connects the form with OE *dēog* 'he concealed himself' from a root *√dʰeu̯k he says resulted from a metathesis of PIE *√keu̯dʰ 'hide'. Quite differently, Klingenschmitt, 1975a, 77 = 2005, 150,

fn. 1 proposed derivation from PT *tpå̄k- < pre-PT *ptāk-, which would imply
that TB *c*- and -*au*- have to be analogical innovations.

ᴬtuṅk-ⁱñ̃ñ- 'love' → *täṅkw-ᵃñ̃ñ-* 'id.'

tek- 'touch' → *täk-* 'id.'

[*tonokäṃ* in 259 b 3 is interpreted as a possible 3.sg. verbal form by Adams,
        DoT, 310; however, such a stem could only belong to the *koloktär*
        type, and in this case we would rather expect a middle, so this
        analysis remains uncertain.]

ᴬtkāl- → *ᴬtkälᵃˀ-* 'illuminate'

ᴬtkälᵃˀ- 'erleuchten', 'illuminate' (tr) (-/-/a)
      Prs — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
           Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II
      Pt I (a) -,-, *täklā-ṃ*; —
      PPt *täklo*
      Ipv —
Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ IV 'erhellen, erklären', 'illuminate, illustrate' (tr) (—)
      Prs VIII — Imp —
           nt-Part *tkälṣantās*
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
           Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —
Sᴇᴍ. The root is left untranslated in the manuals, but the semantics of the
kausativum can now be determined on the evidence of the Old Turkish
parallel MaitrHami XI 10 b 30ff. of A 273 a 3: *(cemäk akṣari ri)ṣakäśśi raritwuṣ*
• *mā nu nervānac ritwont rake tkäl[ṣant]ā(s) (• wasäṃ mosann ats akṣris*
kaśaṃ yäñc); identification by Pinault, 1999, 199, restoration and translation
according to Pinault, in print a: "Die Schriften mit einer derartigen Schaffung
(Bildung) [sind] diese von Rṣis geschaffenen Schriftzeichen; aber, weil wir die
für das Nirvāṇa passende Rede erhellen, deswegen zählen (wörtl. zum Zählen
kommen) sie nicht zu der (geeigneten) Schrift". For TA *täklā-ṃ* in A 153 b 2,

see Schmidt, 1997, 235. Pinault, in print also connects TA *tkālluneyo* in A 397 b 2 (for which TG, 441 set up isolated *ᴬtkāl-*) with this root.

ᴬtpuk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'hide' → *tuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'id.'

***trāpp*ᵃ-** 'straucheln, stolpern', 'trip' (itr) (m/a/-)

    Prs IV (m) —;-,-, *troppontär* Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *troppomane*
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V (a) -,-, *trāppaṃ*;— Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt I in
    PPt *tatrāppaṣ*
    Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs *troppontär* listed in TEB II, 200 without ref. can be found in THT 1622 frg. b b 3. The subjunctive shows initial accent. The PPt *tatrāppaṣ* is attested in PK NS 53 b 4 (see Pinault, 1988, 101).

= *ᴬtrāp*ᵃ- 'stocken', 'falter' (itr) (—)

    Prs IV — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *trapmāṃ*
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

SEM. Whereas in TB the verb has always the meaning 'trip (with the feet)', the once attested TA form refers to the voice (A 79 b 3). ETYM. Usually connected with PIE *√trep 'treten, stampfen' (²LIV, 650; without Toch.); see Adams, DoT, 314 with ref., who sets up PT *trāpw-, and no doubt TA *trapmāṃ* could be the final outcome of a form *trapwmaṃ*. On the other hand, the assumption of a "redoublement secondaire" (as per VW I, 511) in order to account for TB -*pp*- is rather ad hoc. Since we have a Prs IV stem paradigm, I propose to start with an abstract noun pre-PT *trŏpmā 'stumbling', i.e., an ŏ-grade *meh₂*-stem, turning into *træ/āpμā as basis of a denominative PT *trāpwā- (for lenition *m* > μ, see the ref. in Malzahn, 2005, 389ff.).

***trāsk*ᵃ-** '(zer)kauen', 'chew' (tr) (a/-/-)

    Prs II (a) -,-, *treṣṣäṃ*;— Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —

Sub V — Opt —
      Ger II *trāskalye* Abstr II — Priv —
      Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

trās(k)alye ... tsāltalye in H 149.X.5 a 6/b 1 is the equivalent of Skt. *khādanīyabhojanīya-* 'solid and soft food' (Couvreur, 1954a, 46). The same phrase is now also attested in PK NS 95 b 6; see Pinault, 2000, 82 and 99f. The subjunctive stem has persistent initial accent.

= ^A*trāsk^ä-* '(zer)kauen', 'chew' (tr) (-/a/-)
      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub V (a) -,-, *trāskaṣ-äṃ*;— Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt I in
      PPt *tāträskus*
      Ipv —

Etym. To be derived from PIE *√treh₃ĝ 'zernagen, zerbeißen' (²LIV, 647), PT *tärsk- < PIE *tr̥h₃ĝ-sk̂e/o-; see Hackstein, 1995, 178ff. and cf. Adams, DoT, 319. This is one of the very few roots where the present stem is synchronically less complex than the subjunctive stem. The once attested TB Prs II *treṣṣäṃ* (282 b 4) is surely to be analyzed as Prs II (the root can in this case synchronically still be set up as *trāsk^ä-*, pace Eyþórsson, 1993, 49, fn. 19). The root ablaut is far from clear; if TA/TB *trāsk-* goes back to pre-PT *trōgsk-*, *treṣṣ-* is most probably a back-formation.

tränk- 'beklagen', 'lament' (tr) (-/a/a)
      Prs I — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *tränmane* (MQ)
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub I (a) — Opt -,-, *trañci*;—
            Ger II — Abstr II *tränkalyñe* Priv —
            Inf —
      Sub II — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II *trañcalñe* Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt I (a) -,-, *trañcā-neś*;—
      PPt —
      Ipv —

The Pt *trañcā-neś* that was said to be attested in an unpublished Berlin text by Thomas, 1997, 111 can be found in THT 1507 b 5. The Abstr *tr[ä]nkälñe* is also

attested in THT 1167 a 4, the *m*-Part *trä̀mane* also in THT 1170 frg. c a 1, and the thematic stem variant *trañcalñe* in the small fragment THT 1537 frg. d a 2: //// *(re?)k[i]sa tr̠añcalñe* //// "lament with (wo)rd(?)". The fact that the *ā*-preterit shows a palatalized root final in any case predicts the existence of a subjunctive stem of Class II.

= ^A*trä̀k-* 'sagen, sprechen', 'say, speak' (tr) (x/-/-)

> Prs I (x) *trä̀käm, trä̀kät, trä̀käṣ; trä̀kmäś-śi,-, trä̀kiñc* |
>
>> -,-, *trä̀ktär;-,-, trä̀käntär* Imp -, *crä̀käṣt, crä̀käs;-,-,crä̀kär*
>> nt-Part *trä̀käntāp*
>> m-Part *trä̀kmāṃ*
>> Ger I *trä̀käl* Abstr I —
>> Inf *trä̀ktsi*
>
> Sub — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II —
>
> Pt —
> PPt —
> Ipv —

^A*we-* 'say' provides the suppletive subjunctive, preterit, PPt and imperative. The middle has only passive function (see Schmidt, 1974, 207). ETYM. Winter, 1960, 184 proposed a relation of this root with ^{AB}*tärk^ā-* 'let out, emit', and he is followed by Schmidt, 1988, 477ff. and 1990, 104f., who sets up a nasal present *tr-n̥-h₂- (sic, for expected *tr̥-n-h₂-) as a preform, which is doubtful for morphological and phonological reasons (see chap.s Prs VII 29.3., fn. 12 and *tk*-Roots, fn. 1), all the more because beside the irregular *tr-n̥-h₂- Schmidt also sets up a stem with the usual syllabification *tr̥-n-h₂- which he says is continued by Prs VI TA *tärnā-* from ^A*tärk^ā-* 'let out, emit'. However, it is rather the narrower TB meaning 'lament' that is older than the wider TA meaning 'speak'.

^A*trä̀k-* 'cling' → *treṅk-* 'id.'

^A*träm-* 'tremble' → ^A*tärm-* 'id.'

^A*träs-* '?' (?) (m/-/-)

> Prs VIII (m) —;-,-, *trässantär* Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
>> Inf —
>
> Sub — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II —
>
> Pt —
> PPt —
> Ipv —

Unclear hapax in A 155 a 3: //// *plācänyo trässantä knäntä* "with words they ... [and] they strew".

trik⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich irren, verwirrt sein', 'go astray, be confused' (itr) (m/-/a)

        Prs III (m) -, *triketar, triketär;* — Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I *trikelye* Abstr I *trikelyñe*

        Sub V — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II *trikalñe* (MQ) Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt I (a) -,-, *trīkā* (MQ); —

        PPt *trikau | trikoṣ*

        Ipv —

The (substantivized) Ger I *trikelye* in H 149.X.3 (= HMR 1) b 2 has the approximate meaning 'Rauschtrank' (see Thomas, 1952, 60). The Abstr I *trikelyñ(e)* is attested in the small fragment THT 2382 frg. l b 2 (MQ), the Pt I *trīkā* in 339 a 4 (see Schmidt, 1974, 43, fn. 3). For the problematic Priv *(a)traikatte*, see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.2.

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'verfehlen', 'fehlen, in die Irre gehen', 'in die Irre führen',

        'miss, fail''fail, go astray, stumble', 'lead astray' (tr/itr) (a/x/a)

        Prs VIII (a) (tr/itr) -,-, *trikṣäṃ;-,-, trikseṃ* Imp —

                nt-Part *trīkṣeñca*

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub II (x) (tr/itr) -,-, *triśäṃ;-, triścer, trīkeṃ* Opt *triśim,-, trīśi;*

                -,-, *triśyeṃ | triśimar,-,-;* —

                Ger II *triśälle* (MQ) Abstr II *triśalñe* Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt III (a) (?) -,-, *traiksa;* —

        PPt *tetriku | tetrikoṣ*

        Ipv —

The *nt*-Part *trīkṣeñc(a)* is attested in THT 1686 a 3, the 3.pl. Opt *[t]riśy[e](ṃ)* in H 150.111 b 2 (see Broomhead I, 149).

KAUSATIVUM II act. 'in die Irre führen', 'lead astray', mid. 'ohnmächtig werden',

        'faint' (tr) (a/-/x)

        Prs IXb (a) -,-, *trīkäṣṣäṃ* (MQ); — Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt II (x) -,-, *traika-ne;* — | -,-, *traikate;* —

        PPt *tetrikoṣ*

        Ipv —

A Prs or Sub *trīkäṣṣäṃ* is attested in the small fragment THT 2380 frg. z a 1 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.): //// *läkle trīkaṣṣaṃ* //// "suffering leads astray". The Pt *traikane* in 90 b 3 (thus the correct reading in the manuscript) is to be

emended to *traikate*, according to TochSprR(B), i.e., a middle form; differently, WTG, 251 (*traika-ne*) and TEB I, 246, § 440,2. The form means 'he fainted'; see Schmidt, 2001, 320; a middle *traikate* is further said to be attested in H 149.290 b 3 by WTG, 251; Broomhead I, 214 and Schmidt, 1974, 137, but I think that one rather has to read *traika-ne* here: *palsko traika-ne ot talānte • teksa aśyai omṣameṃ* "the spirit of the wretched one led him astray; he touched the nun from above". In this case we would have a distinction between an active transitive 'lead astray' and a middle (intransitive/passive) 'faint'. Broomhead I, 270 restores *tr[ai](ka)////* in H 150.119 a 1, which is, of course, unclear with respect to voice and meaning and can as likely be restored to a Pt III *traiksa*. A contextless 3.sg. Pt *traika-ñ* is furthermore found in IOL Toch 376 a 3 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.). The PPt *tetrikoṣ* in 212 a 4 belongs to the kausativum, the other attestations of the PPt *tetriku* / *tetrikoṣ* rather to the antigrundverb paradigm, cf. the passages in Saito, 2006, 120f.

= ^{A}*trik(ā)-* 'verwirrt sein; ohnmächtig werden', 'be confused; faint'

      (itr) (m+/a/a)
      Prs III (m+) -,-, *trikatär*; — Imp —
            nt-Part *trikantās*
            m-Part —
            Ger I *trikal* Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub V (a) -,-, *trekaṣ*; — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt I (a) -,-, *trik*; —
      PPt *triko*
      Ipv —

For the meaning 'faint', see Schmidt, 1974, 123f.

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'verfehlen', 'verwirrt sein', 'verwirren', 'fail, miss', 'be
      confused', 'confuse, lead astray' (tr/itr) (a+/-/a)
      Prs VIII (a+) (tr/itr) *triksam*,-,-;-,-, *trikseñc* Imp —
            nt-Part *trikṣant*
            m-Part *trikäsmāṃ*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf *trikässi*
      Sub II — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II *triślune*
      Pt III (a) (itr) *trīkū*,-,-; —
      PPt *tatriku*
      Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs TA *trikāṣ* listed in TEB I, 175, § 298,4 is maybe only reconstructed on the basis of the attested forms. As is the case in TB, the forms of this stem can either have transitive, intransitive, or causative meaning; see chap. Valency 45.1.1.1. Therefore, an intransitive 1.sg. Pt III TA *trīkū* in A 295 a 4 (analyzed as 1.sg. active by Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 54 = Winter, 2005, 438) would not be an irregularity within this paradigm, and apart from the more

archaic 1.sg. ending TA -*u*, the *ä*-grade of the root can also be regarded as an archaism; see also chap. Pt III 9.1.4.

Kausativum II 'gegen jd. fehlen, sündigen', 'sin against sb.' (tr) (—)

Prs — Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part
Ger I — Abstr I —
Inf
Sub — Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt II in
PPt *caccrīku*
Ipv —

Sem. For the remarkable valency of the root, see chap. Valency 4.5.1.1.1. Etym. Adams, DoT, 316 and ²LIV, 648 follow the connection with nominal forms like Lat. *trīcae* 'trifles' (cf. VW I, 514f.), setting up a PIE root *√trei̯K 'verfehlen' (thus ²LIV), from which primary verbal forms are only found in Tocharian.

ᴬ*trip-* → ᴬ*triw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'mix'

triw⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich vermischen, sich schütteln', 'be mixed, shaken' (itr) (m/m/a)

Prs III (m) -,-, *triwetär*;— Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub V (m) -,-, *triwātär*;— Opt *triwoymar*,-,-;—
Ger II — Abstr II *triwālñe* Priv —
Inf *triwātsi*
Pt I (a) —;-,-, *triwāre*
PPt *triwoṣ*
Ipv —

The 1.sg. Opt *triwoymar* is found in PK AS 5C a 1 and PK NS 26 a 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 3.pl. Pt *triwāre* in PK AS 16.3 b 2 (Pinault, 1989a, 157).

Kausativum I 'vermischen, schütteln', 'mix, shake (of body parts)'
(tr) (a+/-/m)

Prs IXb (a+) -,-, *trīwaṣṣäṃ* (MQ);— Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part *triwäskemane/triwaskemane* (MQ)
Ger I *trīwäṣṣälle/triwaṣle/trīwaṣälle* (MQ) Abstr I —
Sub IXb — Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II *triwäṣṣälñe* Priv —
Inf —
Pt II (m) -, *traiywatai* (MQ),-;—
PPt *tetriwu* | *tetriwoṣ*
Ipv II (a) *pätrīwa-ne*;-

The imperative form *pätrīwa-ne* 'mix it!' attested in H 149.add 119 b 4 and b 5 has transitive semantics (cf. WTG, 251), and it is hence rather to be analyzed as Ipv II than Ipv I (pace the manuals); see chap. Ipv 37.1.

= ^A*triw^(a)-* 'sich vermischen', 'be mixed' (itr) (m/a/-)

   Prs III (m) —;-,-, *triwantär* Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part *triwamāṃ*
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub V (a) —;-,-, *triweñc* Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt I in
   PPt *triwo*
   Ipv —

A 3.sg. Prs TA *triwatär* is only listed in TEB II, 108, and probably merely reconstructed; the 3.pl. Prs (from an unpublished fragment, as per TG, 272, § 389) is attested in THT 1134 b 3: //// *ywār triwantra puk* ////. The 3.pl. form TA *tr(i)weñc* found in A 378, 4 (//// *ywār tr(i)weñc-ci* •) that TG, 443 analyses as a present, is the expected subjunctive form, which is an unproblematic syntactic assumption for this passage.

KAUSATIVUM I 'vermischen', 'mix' (tr) (—)

   Prs VIII — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I *triwäṣäl* Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt II in
   PPt *tatriwu/tattripu*
   Ipv —

TA *triwäṣäl* is attested in PK NS 2 a (?) 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c., already listed by Couvreur, 1956, 98, but without ref.). TA *tattripu* found in A 455 a 4 is usually regarded as a PPt variant of this root: //// *sāṃtkäntuyo tattripu* //// "mixed with remedies" (cf. Saito, 2006, 124). ETYM. If the PPt TA *tattripu* belongs here and shows the older root structure, one has to set up PT *trip-, cf. Adams, DoT, 317, but it cannot be excluded that *p* for *w* is merely a hypercorrect spelling. For further connections of PT *triw-, see Adams, DoT, 317.

^A*trisk-* 'erschallen, dröhnen', 'sound, boom' (itr) (a/-/-)

   Prs VIII (a) -,-, *triskäṣ;* — Imp —;-,-, *triskṣār*
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —

Sub — Opt —
  Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

For the analysis as Prs VIII and the intransitive valency of the Imp TA *trikṣār*, see Hackstein, 1995, 101ff.

KAUSATIVUM I 'erschallen lassen', 'let boom' (tr) (-/-/a)

Prs VIII — Imp —
  nt-Part —
  m-Part *triskäsmāṃ*
  Ger I — Abstr I —
  Inf —
Sub — Opt —
  Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt II (a) -,-, *tatrisäk*; —
PPt —
Ipv —

ETYM. PIE *√(s)treig (Gk. τρίζω 'make a shrill sound, squeak'); see Hackstein, 1995, 103f. (not in ²LIV).

truk^ā̆- '± geben, zuteilen', '± give, portion' (tr) (—)

Prs VI — Imp —
  nt-Part —
  m-Part —
  Ger I *truknālle* Abstr I —
Sub V — Opt —
  Ger II *trukāle/trukālle* Abstr II — Priv —
  Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The Ger II *trukāle* is often attested in business documents (always written with simple *-l-*); according to Sieg, 1950, 213, its meaning is 'Zuteilung'; the same form with geminated *-ll-* is probably attested in the non-business text 558 b 1, where, however, word separation and meaning are uncertain. Hackstein, 1995, 79 furthermore sets up a Prs IV stem (*trokotär*) on the evidence of the noun *trokol* 'Lieferung' (hapax in 441 a 3; Adams, DoT, 321 translates '± provisions'). To be sure, apart from the fact that this root already has a Prs VI, one would not expect a Prs IV from a root of the shape *truk^ā̆-*, and even under the hypothesis of a secondary full grade variant (like to be seen with *lit^ā̆-* 'fall', Prs IV *laitotär*), one would expect **traukotär* : **traukol*. As a matter of fact, abstracts in *-l* were in my view never formed from a present stem when there existed verbal stems other than the respective present stem at all; see chap. PPt 14.2. (cf., e.g., *kaläl* 'womb' from *käl-* 'bear', which is built

on the Sub I stem or the bare root itself); especially for abstracts in -*ol* belonging to historical stems in (*)-*ā*-, see Pinault, 2008, 383f. and 2009, 481f.

trus- 'zerfleischen', 'tear to pieces' (tr) (a/-/-)
        Prs II (a) — ;-,-, *trusen-me* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
Hapax in H add.149 77 b 1: *śāmanentso troṅ trusen-me śwān-me mīsa* "they {= different carnivores} tear up the innards of the living [and] they devour their flesh" (cf. Broomhead I, 246f.). Non-A-character can be reconstructed with some certainty.

= ᴬ**trus-** 'zerfleischen', 'tear to pieces' (tr) (-/-/a)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II (a) -,-, *tatrūsā-ṃ*; —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
Hapax in A 340 b 4: *(kātsaṣiṃ tru)ṅk tatrūsā-ṃ • tāpa-ṃ śāmānäṃ* "er {= the dog} riß ihm die [Bauch]höhle auf [und] fraß ihn lebendig" (restoration according to TEB II, 33, translation according to Sieg, Übers. II, 38); differently Pinault, 2004a, 257 for line b 3f.: *śāyu oki (lyukrā särki pākär tak puskasyo ṣu)ṅk tatrūsā-ṃ* "Eine Art Hundertfüßler (erschien unmittelbar darauf und) zerriß (die Brust mit den Muskeln)".

ᴬ**truskᵃ?-** 'anschirren', 'yoke' (?) (—)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I in
        PPt *tursko*

Ipv —

TA *tursko* 'working animal' is attested in A 361, 9. For the analysis of this form as a PPt of a root [AB]*trusk-* 'yoke', which is also attested in TB *truskäñña* 'attellement, harnachement', I follow Pinault, 2002, 314 (with ref.). According to Pinault, the root is cognate with Ved. *dhúr-* '(part of the) yoke' and Hitt. *turiya-* 'to yoke' and hence goes back to PIE *$d^{h}ur̥H$-sk̂e/o-.

treṅk- 'haften, hängen an', 'cling, stick, adhere' (itr) (m/m/m)

        Prs IXa (m) -,-, *treṅkastär;-,-, treṅkaskentär* Imp -,-, *treṅkäṣṣi* (sic); —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I *treṅkaṣle* Abstr I —

        Sub I (m) — Opt *treñcīmar,-,-;* —

            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv *etreṅkätte*

            Inf —

        Pt III (m) -,-, *treṅksate;* —

        PPt *tetreṅku | tetreṅkoṣ*

        Ipv —

A 3.sg. Imp *treṅkäṣṣi* seems attested in the small fragment IOL Toch 1105 a 2 (cf. Tamai, 2007, s.v.; the form is without context, and may hence be an MQ form). The obliquus PPt *tetreṅkoṣ* is, e.g., found in 149 a 3.

~ [A]*träṅk-* 'haften, hängen an', 'cling, stick, adhere' (itr) (m+/m/m)

        Prs VIII (m+) -, *träṅkäṣtār, träṅkäṣtär;* — Imp —

            nt-Part *träṅkṣant*

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

            Inf *träṅksī*

        Sub I (m) -,-, *träṅktär;* — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II *träṅklune*

        Sub VII — Opt —

            Ger II *träṅkñäl* Abstr II —

        Pt III (m) -,-, *träṅksāt;* —

        PPt *taträṅku*

        Ipv —

KAUSATIVUM I 'hängen an', 'cling to' (tr) (—)

        Prs — Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

            Inf —

        Sub — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt II in

        PPt *cacräṅku*

        Ipv

The PPt TA *cacräṅku* has the same semantics as the grundverb, but is construed with direct object: A 222 a 7 *k̮uleyaṃ pältsäk cacräṅku* "[da] er [sein] Denken an eine Frau gehängt [hatte]" (Schmidt, 1974, 470). In contrast, the grundverb governs secondary cases; see, e.g., the examples with locative apud Kölver, 1965, 106f., such as A 413 b 3: *yśalmsaṃ mā träṅkäṣtär* "er hängt nicht an den Sinnen".

ETYM. PT *tränk-, TB has generalized the *e*-vocalism; further connections are uncertain.

twāṅk̑ᴬ- '± anhaben, anziehen', '± wear, don' (?) (-/-/m)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I (m) -,-, *twaṅkāte*; —
        PPt *tatwāṅkau* | *tatwāṅkaṣ*
        Ipv —

The Pt I *twaṅkāte* is attested in PK NS 70 b 2 and the PPt *tatwāṅkaṣ* in PK AS 17G b 4 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). Schmidt, 1986, 189 furthermore proposes to restore a 2.sg. Pt IV *tw(ā)ṅ[kä](ṣṣatai)* in KVāc 12 b 2 with question mark; see below.

= ᴬ*twāṅk̑ᴬ-* '± anhaben, anziehen', '± wear, don' (tr) (-/m/-)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub V (m) -,-, *twāṅkatär*; — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I in
        PPt *tātwäṅku*
        Ipv —

SEM. The traditional translation of this root ('einzwängen' as per WTG, 252 with question mark; cf. TEB II, 108, 201) is based on an etymological connection with PIE *√twenk 'bedrängen, einzwängen' (²LIV, 655), and this meaning is, according to Schmidt, 1984, 149, "durch die wenigen Belegstellen keineswegs gerechtfertigt"; but note that Schmidt, 1986, 75, nevertheless, translates 'gezwängt' in KVac 12 b 2, and there such a translation is indeed fitting: *taisa ente nraintane tetemu ṣaiyt pälkoṣ-eñcuwañeṃ pa[t]r(·)[kä](·)[t](·) tw(ā)ṅ[kä](ṣṣatai ?)* //// "als du in den Höllen [wieder]-geboren worden warst, [in] glühende Eisenplatten(?) gezwängt". Adams, DoT, 322f., rather proposes a wider meaning '± wear' (or 'don' or 'doff') for the root, which also fits the new TA attestation in YQ 7 b 4: *knuṃtsäṃ wsā-*

yokāṃ aṃśuk tātwäṅkunt "wrapped in a supple, gold-colored cloak" (Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 110f.).

tw^ᵃ-/ twās^(ᵃ)- 'leuchten', 'shine' (itr) (m/-/-)

    Prs IXa (m) -,-, *twasastär*; — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

A PPt *twoṣ* is read in H 149.316 (= IOL Toch 105) b 3 by Couvreur, 1954, 84 (cf. WTG, 163, fn. 2), Broomhead I, 286, and Peyrot, 2007, s.v., but I would not exclude a reading *nwoṣ*; the meaning of the passage is entirely unclear. For 342 b 7, I follow the reading *nwau* by TochSprR(B); on these passages, see also s.v. *nu^(ᵃ)-* 'cry'.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'anzünden', 'kindle' (tr) (-/a/-)

    Prs — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub IXb (a) -,-, *twāṣṣäṃ*; — Opt *twāsäṣṣim*,-,-; —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf *twāsässi*
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

The middle *twasastär* in 591 b 4 is intransitive, as per Thomas, 1966, 266. For the semantics and stem formations, see Hackstein, 1995, 348ff. In contrast to Hackstein, I analyze *twāsäsk-* as a Sub IXb based on the extended stem *twāsā-*, which has a parallel in *swāsā-* 'rain'; see below and the discussion in chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.6.2.3. The Prs IXa *twasastär* may be a back-formation to the Prs IXb.

= *^Atw^ᵃ-/ ^Atwās^(ᵃ)-* 'brennen', 'burn' (?) (a/a/-)

    Prs VIII (a) -, *tuṣt*,-;-,-, *tuseñc* Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf —
    Sub V (a) (itr) — Opt -,-, *twāsiṣ*; —
          Ger II — Abstr II *twāslune*
    Pt I in
    PPt *tātwsu*

Ipv —

The valency of TA *tuṣt* in A 92 a 5 can be either intransitive (thus Hackstein 1995, 349: "warum brennst du mir immer feiner?") or transitive: *k̭yal lykäly lykäly tuṣt ñi* "why do you [god Karman] enkindle me finer and finer?". A 3.pl. TA *tuseñc-äṃ* can be gained from A 28 a 5: //// *ktuseñc-äṃ* •. Alternatively, the form TA *ktuseñc-äṃ* may belong to a root ᴬ*kätw-* 'deceive' (as per TG, 428), but note the problem of the root vocalism; see s.v. ᴬ*katw-*.

ETYM. The root behaves somewhat similarly to *s(u)wᵃ-/swās⁽ᵃ⁾-* and ᴬ*s(u)w⁽ᵃ⁾-/*ᴬ*swās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'rain'. The existence of an *s*-extended TA PPt *tätwsu* < *tātwāsāwä* formed to a preterit stem of Class I TA **twāsā* and the subjunctive stem TA *twāsā-* speak in favor of the assumption that both TB and TA inherited a stem **twāsā-* already from PT; see the discussion in chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.6.2.3. The evidence of both TB and TA clearly points to PT **twāsā-*, not **täwāsā-*; on the other hand, the obvious explanation for the TA Prs VIII *tuṣt*, *tuseñc* by secondary truncation of stem-final PT **-ā-* in a Prs VIII or a former Prs IX (as probably suggested by Hackstein, 1995, 351) would seem to require the former existence of a pre-TA stem **täwā-* parallel to PT **sāwā-* 'rain' (quite differently on TA *tuṣt*, *tuseñc* Peters, 2006, 336). The root is obviously to be derived from PIE **√dʰu̯eh₂* 'Rauch machen' (²LIV, 158), as per Hackstein, 1995, 18 and 352f.; quite differently Adams, DoT, 299.

N

ᴬ*nas-* 'be' → *nes-* 'id.'

nāk- 'tadeln', 'blame, reprimand, reproach' (tr) (m/-/m)

      Prs VIII (m) *naksemar*,-,- *nākṣtär/nakṣtär*;-,-, *naksentär/ nāksentär*

           Imp —;-,-, *nakṣīyentär*

           nt-Part —

           m-Part —

           Ger I *nakṣalye* Abstr I —

      Sub I — Opt —

           Ger II — Abstr II *nākälyñe* Priv *anākätte*

           Inf *nāktsi*

      Pt III (m) -,-, *nāksate/naksate*;-,-, *nāksante/naksante*

      PPt *nanāku*

      Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs variant *nākṣtär* is attested in THT 1340 frg. d b 1 (MQ) beside *nakṣtär* in 16 a 6 (Š) and 35 a 4 (MQ). Beside the expected 3.pl. Prs *naksentär*, there is a 3.pl. variant *nāksenträ* found in 251 a 2 (Š); as for the preterit, there are a few attestations of forms written *naksa°* even in standard texts, while *nāksa°* seems to be attested more often (e.g., also in PK AS 18 B a 2). Whether one can restore a 1.sg. Pt *(nǎ)ksemar* 'I reprimanded' in 36 a 4 (MQ) remains

uncertain (see ²TochSprR(B), 205). For the stem variation *naks-/nāks-*, see chap. Pt III 9.1.1.

= ᴬ*nāk-* 'tadeln', 'blame, reprimand, reproach' (tr) (m+/m/m)

> Prs VIII (m+) -,-, *nākäṣtär*; — Imp -,-, *nākṣāt*; —
>> nt-Part *nākṣant*
>> m-Part *nākäsmāṃ*
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
>> Inf —
> Sub VII (m) -, *nākäñtär*, *nākäñtär*;-,-, *nākñantär* Opt —
>> Ger II *nākñlye* Abstr II —
> Pt III (m) —; *nāksāmät*,-,-
> PPt *nānku*
> Ipv —

A 3.sg. Pt TA *nāksāt* is only listed in TEB II, 110 and most likely only reconstructed on the basis of the attested 1.pl. form. Eᴛʏᴍ. According to Hackstein, 1995, 65ff., we have a *k*-extension of PIE *√h₂/₃neh₃ 'blame' (cf. ²LIV, 282 *√h₂neh₃ 'tadeln'); according to Peters, 2004, 434, fn. 24, to be derived from PIE *√nek̂ (²LIV, 451f.: 'verschwinden') with (only partly) generalized ō-grade taken over from the perfect; see also chap. Pt III 9.1.1.

nān⁽ä⁾- 'sich zeigen, erscheinen', 'appear' (itr) (m/m/m)

> Prs V (m) -,-, *nanātär* (MQ); — Imp -,-, *nanoytär*; —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
> Sub V (m) -,-, *nănătär*; — Opt -,-, *nănoytär*; —
>> Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
>> Inf —
> Pt I (m) —;-,-, *nanāṃte*
> PPt —
> Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. *nanāträ* in PK AS 12D (MQ) a 2 and the 3.sg.mid. *nanoyträ* in 389 b 2 are rather present stem formations (i.e., indicative present and imperfect forms), as per Couvreur, 1954, 83 pace WTG, 252; note that according to G.-J. Pinault (p.c.), one has to read *nanāträ* and not *nanaträ* in PK AS 12D a 2; see the passage below s.v. *yätkᵃ⁾-* '?'; the analysis of *nanātär* in 598 b 3 remains unclear, because it is attested in fragmentary context and the same is true for isolated *nanātar-cä* in THT 1335 frg. c a 2 (MQ). A 3.sg. Sub *[n](a)[n](ā)tar̩* is attested beyond doubt in THT 1539 frg. g a 1 (see Schmidt, 2006, 461), and a 3.sg. Opt *[n](a)noyt(ä)r* is read by Schmidt in 81 a 3 (most recently 2001, 310, fn. 42 contra ²TochSprR(B)). Since the root and the stem-final vowels in both of these certain subjunctive stem forms are damaged, we cannot say anything certain about the accentuation of the Sub V. The 3.pl. Pt *nanāṃte* is attested in G-Su 3 (Pinault, 1987, 138).

KAUSATIVUM I 'zeigen', 'show' (tr) (-/a/-)
        Prs IXa — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I *nanāṣale* (sic) Abstr I —
        Sub IXb (a) -,-, *nānäṣṣäṃ-ne;* — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The Ger I is attested as a gloss on the Skt. part. necessitatis *parijñeyaḥ* 'for knowing' in Or. 15009/89 b 4; see Tamai, 2009, 661. Pace WTG, 252, *nānäṣṣäṃ-ne* in the Prātimokṣa text 325 a 5 is Sub not Prs; see Couvreur, 1954c, 114.

ETYM. Maybe to be derived from a PT *knānā- (just like the forms from *A*knā- 'know'), ultimately from *√ĝneh₃ 'recognize'; see Hilmarsson, 1996, 213f.; Adams, DoT, 333.

nāsk- 'baden, schwimmen', 'bathe, swim' (itr) (a+/a/a)
        Prs II (a+) -,-, *nāṣṣäṃ;-,-, nāskeṃ* Imp -,-, *naṣṣi* (sic); —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *naskemane*
            Ger I *naṣṣalle* Abstr I —
        Sub II (a) — Opt -,-, *nāṣṣi;* —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf *nāṣtsi*
        Pt I (a) -,-, *nāṣṣa;* —
        PPt *nanāṣṣūsa*
        Ipv —

According to Schmidt, 2001b, 75, a 3.sg. Prs *nāṣṣäṃ* is attested in a graffito in the 'Treppenhöhle' in Qizil. *nāskeṃ* in H 149.198 (= U 12) a 3 is the equivalent of 3.pl. Prs Skt. *snānti* 'they swim' (see Thomas, 1971, 24f.); TochSprR(B), glossary, 133 furthermore lists a 3.pl. Sub *nāskeṃ* (without ref.), which may refer exactly to this passage, but *nāskeṃ* is here certainly a present. Hackstein, 1995, 172 doubts whether *naṣṣi* in H 149.69 (= IOL Toch 19) a 3 is an imperfect of this root (thus, e.g., WTG, 252), because elsewhere in this text accented /ā/ is written as ⟨ā⟩; on the other hand, such a misspelling (i.e., omission of the *ā*-vowel) is not unlikely, and an Imp does make some sense in that passage: *(tu)sa īme tetrīku sū naṣṣi orkäntai* "therefore with confused spirit he swam hither and thither" (see Broomhead I, 158 and Peyrot, 2007, s.v.). *nāskoy* which is analyzed as another Opt from this root by the manuals rather belongs to *nāskᵃ-* 'spin' (see below). The Imp *naṣṣītär* listed by TochSprR(B), glossary, 133 — arguably referring to FK 590 (= PK NS 40) a 4 — has to be restored to *(sai)naṣṣītär*, according to Schmidt, 1974, 16f., fn. 4 (see below s.v. *sai-n-* 'lean on').

Kausativum I 'baden', 'bathe' (tr) (x/-/-)

   Prs IXb (x) —;-,-, *nāksäskentär* (sic) Imp —;-,-, *nāskäṣyeṃ* (Š)
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
     Inf —
   Pt IV in
   PPt *nanaskaṣu* (MQ)
   Ipv —

A 3.pl.mid. Prs *n[ā]k[s]äsk[e]nträ* (instead of †*nāskäskenträ*) is attested in a graffito in the 'Treppenhöhle' in Qizil, according to Schmidt, 2001b, 75. *nāskä[ṣ]* //// in the graffito Qu 34 is either to be restored to a 3.sg. Pt or to an nt-Part of this root, according to Pinault, 1994a, 176, 178, and 191; 2000a, 158. Etym. To be derived from the present stem *snh₂-sḱe/o- from PIE *√(s)neh₂ 'baden, schwimmen' (²LIV, 572); see Hackstein, 1995, 172ff.; Adams, DoT, 334.

nāskᵃ- 'spinnen', 'spin' (tr) (-/a/-)

   Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub V (a) — Opt -,-, *nāskoy*; —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —

nāskoy is a hapax in 154 (= H 149.22) b 4. For morphological reasons, it cannot belong to *nāsk-* 'bath' (pace the manuals), as correctly seen by Adams, 1989a, 5ff. and DoT, 334. The form is rather to be analyzed as a TB stem formation from the same PT root that is with certainty attested by ᴬ*nāskᵃ-* 'spin'. The passage in question is, in my opinion, to be translated: "as a blind man spins a garment(?) [and] it will burn [if] he inadvertently/helplessly throws it into the maternal hearth ... it burns in the hearth's [fire] of inconstancy"; see Malzahn, 2004, 212ff.

= ᴬ*nāskᵃ-* 'spinnen', 'spin' (tr) (-/-/m)

   Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt I (m) *nāske*,-,-; —

PPt *nānäsku*

Ipv —

SEM. The meaning of the TA forms is assured by an Old Turkish parallel; see Pinault, 2001, 132f. ETYM. PIE *√sneh₁ 'spin' (Pinault, l.c.; Hackstein, 2002, 10 with fn. 24; ²LIV, 571f.).

näk- act. 'zerstören, verlieren', 'destroy, lose', mid. 'zugrunde gehen, verschwinden', 'fall into ruin, disappear' (tr/itr) (x/x/x)

Prs VIII (x) (tr/itr) -, *näkṣt* (MQ), *nakṣäṃ;-,-, näkseṃ* |

-,-, *nakṣtär;-,-, näksentär*

Imp —

nt-Part *näkṣeñca*

m-Part —

Ger I — Abstr I —

Sub I + II (a) (tr) *neku-me,-,-; nkem,-, nakäṃ* Opt —

Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

Inf *naktsi*

Sub III (m) (itr) *nkemar,-, nketär; —* Opt -,-, *näśītär/nśītär; —*

Ger II *nkelle* Abstr II *nkelñe* Priv —

Inf *nketsi*

Pt III (x) (tr/itr) *nekwa, nekasta, neksa; — | -,-, neksate;-,-, neksante*

PPt *nenku | neneköṣ/nenköṣ*

Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs *näkseṃ* is attested in Fill. W 5 a 3. A 1.sg. Sub *neku-me* is to be read in 542 a 1 instead of *teku-me* (from *täk-* 'touch'), according to Schmidt, 1984, 150f. and 1985, 430f. *nakäṃ* in 27 a 5 is to be analyzed as 3.pl. Sub I; see Hackstein, 1995, 85, fn. 136 with ref. The 1.pl. *nkem* is also transitive (cf. Hackstein, l.c.), and thus belongs to the active Sub I, which is possible despite the fact that it shows a thematic ending *-em*, since intrusion of thematic endings into athematic paradigms (esp. in the plural) is not uncommon; whether this form then attests to a subjunctive without initial accent remains, however, unclear, because the small fragment H 149.316 (= IOL Toch 105) may be an MQ text and metrical, so that the form may even show deletion of an accented syllable. The Inf *nketsi* belonging to the Sub III is found in PK AS 17A a 1 (Pinault, 1984b, 168, 174f.) and IOL Toch 543 a 2 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.), the 3.pl. Pt *neksante* in PK AS 17B b 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). Note that the alleged 3.sg. Pt *na[k]sa-(ñ)* in H 150.117 b 3 (thus Broomhead I, 269; emended to *neksā-(ñ)* by Sieg apud Thomas, 1957, 220) has to be read *taksā-c* and belongs to *täkṣᵃ-* '± destroy' (Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 272).

= *Anäk-* act. 'zerstören, verlieren', 'destroy, lose', mid. 'zugrunde gehen, verschwinden', 'fall into ruin, disappear' (tr/itr) (x/m/x)

Prs VIII (a) (tr) -,-, *nkäṣ;-,-, näkseñc* Imp -, *näkṣāṣt,-; —*

nt-Part *näkṣant*

m-Part —

Ger I *näkṣäl* Abstr I —

Inf —

Prs X (m) (itr) -,-, *näknäṣtär;-,-, nkäṃsantär* Imp —;-,-, *nkäṃṣānt*

nt-Part —

m-Part *nkäṃsamāṃ*

Ger I — Abstr I —

Inf —

Sub I (a) (tr) -, *nakät,-;*—

Ger II — Abstr II —

Sub III (m) (itr) -, *nkatār, nkatär;-,-, nkantr-äṃ* Opt -,-, *nśitär;*—

Ger II — Abstr II *nkalune*

Pt 0 (m) (itr) -,-, *nakät;-,-, nakänt*

Pt III (a) (tr) -, *ñakäṣt, ñakäs;-,-, ñakär*

PPt *nanku*

Ipv —

The Ger TA *näkṣäl* in A 2 b 3 has necessitative meaning 'has to be destroyed',
according to Thomas, 1952, 53 and TEB II, 18, fn. 16; see also Pinault, 2008, 226.
The transitive active Sub I 2.sg. TA *nakät* is attested in PK NS 1 a 4: *mar
k̮uleyis mosaṃ kāpñe śol nakät* "you should not destroy your dear life because
of the woman"; TA *nakät* is certainly Sub and not Pt 0 because of the
preceding context: TA *ppāṣār āñcäṃ ñātse yäṣ* "Watch on yourself! Danger
comes." (unpublished, reading and translation according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.;
the form was also mentioned by K. T. Schmidt, apud Jasanoff, 1988, 74, fn. 11
without further ref.). Schmidt, 1983, 130 furthermore restores a 2.sg. Pt III TA
ñ(a)käṣt in A 247 a 1.

SEM./ETYM. On the semantics and stem formations, see Hackstein, 1995, 85ff.
in detail. The PPt of the grundverb can denote both 'lost' and 'destroyed' in
both languages. To be derived from PIE *√neḱ 'verschwinden, verloren gehen'
(²LIV, 451f.); see Adams, DoT, 335.

nätkᵃ- 'fernhalten, wegstoßen', 'hold off, push away' (tr) (a/a/x)

Prs VI (a) -,-, *natknaṃ;*— Imp —

nt-Part —

m-Part —

Ger I *nätknalle* (sic) Abstr I —

Prs VII (a) -,-, *nättaṅkäṃ;*— Imp —

nt-Part —

m-Part —

Ger I — Abstr I —

Sub V (a) -,-, *nātkaṃ* (M);— Opt —

Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

Inf —

Pt I (x) -,-, *ñätka* (MQ);-,-, *ñitkāre-ne*|-, *ñätkatai* (sic, MQ),-;—

PPt *nätkau/nätkowo*

Ipv —

The PPt variant *nätkowo* is attested in PK AS 7O a 1 (unpublished, reading
according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

= *A*nätk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'fernhalten, wegstoßen', 'hold off, push away' (tr) (-/-/m)

   Prs VIII — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf *nätkässi*
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
   Pt II (m) -,-, *nanätkāt;—*
   PPt *ñañitku*
   Ipv —

TA *nanätkāt* and TA *nätkässi* are only listed in TEB II, 110.

Sᴇᴍ./Eᴛʏᴍ. Pace WTG, TEB ("stützen"), the meaning is rather 'hold off, push away' (first proposed by Couvreur, 1954, 91; Schmidt, 1989a, 304 gives as meaning 'schützen, fernhalten'); see Jasanoff, 1978, 39, who derived the root from a PIE present *nud-sk̂e/o- (*√neu̯d, ²LIV, 456 without Toch.) and further (in more detail) Melchert, 1978, 123f., and Pinault, 1988, 154, fn. 15 on the new attestation of *nätkau* in PK NS 53 b 5, and also Pinault, 1988a, 179f. and 1992, 165f. As appealing as the *√nud etymology may appear, it does not fit the persistent root-initial palatalization found in the finite forms of the TB Pt I; this phenomenon could be easier accounted for by a pre-PT proto-form *neT-sk- or *niT-sk- (the latter could be further derived from PIE *ni-dʰh₁-sk̂-; for possible parallels, see Hackstein, 2002, 6ff.).

*A*näp- '?' → *A*täpᵃ- '?'

näm- act. 'neigen', 'bend', mid. 'sich verneigen', 'bow' (tr/itr) (x/m/x)

   Prs VIII (x) (tr/itr) -,-, *namṣäṃ;-,-, namseṃ* | -,-, *namṣtär;—* Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub I (tr) — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II *namalñe* (M)/*nmalyñe* (MQ)
     Inf —
   Sub III (m) (itr) -,-, *nmetär;-,-, nmentär* Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf *ñmetsi* (sic)
   Pt III (x) (tr/itr) —;-,-, *nemar-neś* | -,-, *namtsate-ñ;—*
   PPt *nmau*
   Ipv —

Instead of a Ger I *nmälye* //// one has to read *tsälye* //// at the end of H add.149 62 b 5, as per Couvreur, 1966, 165, but *tsälye* is an unclear form. Similarly, Pt *nemtsamai* (thus the reading in WTG, 253) in PK AS 13D a 2 has to be read *temtsamai*, according to Couvreur, 1954, 89. The initial accent of the Abstr *namalñe* shows that we have to do with a Sub I (and not with Sub II). The 3.sg.mid. Sub *nmetär* is attested in PK AS 13B b 2 (Couvreur, 1954, 86

'wird sich verneigen'), the 3.pl.mid. Sub *nmentär* in the Stein text Kucha 0187 (= Or. 8212/1379) a 10 (first edited by Lévi apud Stein, 1928, 1029f.). On the other hand, palatalized *ñmetsi* in 335 a 5 is certainly an infinitive of this stem as well (cf. WTG, 112 with ref. to Skt. *nāmayati* 'reicht dar': "daß dargereicht werde Speise und Suppe"), and to be regarded as an archaism (see chap. Sub III 20.1.1.). The 3.sg.mid. Pt *namtsate-ñ* is attested in PK AS 17I b 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The PPt *nmau* listed in TEB II, 203 without ref. can be found in THT 1192 a 1. All intelligible active forms are transitive, and all middle forms intransitive (with the possible exception of unclear *namṣtär*).

KAUSATIVUM III 'neigen, verbeugen', 'bend, bow' (tr) (−)

        Prs − Imp −
                nt-Part −
                m-Part −
                Ger I − Abstr I −
        Sub − Opt −
                Ger II − Abstr II − Priv −
                Inf −
        Pt II in
        PPt *ñeñmu/ñeñämū*
        Ipv −

On the meaning of the PPt *ñeñmu*, see Hackstein, 1995, 68.

= ᴬ*näm*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich verneigen', 'bow' (itr) (a+/-/-)

        Prs VIII (a+) (itr) −;-,-, *nämseñc* Imp −
                nt-Part −
                m-Part *nmäsmāṃ*
                Ger I − Abstr I −
                Inf *nmässi*
        Sub V − Opt −
                Ger II − Abstr II *nmālune*
        Sub IX − Opt −
                Ger II − Abstr II *nmāṣlune*
        Pt I in
        PPt (itr) *nmo*
        Pt II in
        PPt (itr) *ñañmu*
        Pt III in
        PPt (itr) *nanmū*
        Ipv −

In Tocharian A, all of the attested forms are intransitive, even the active Prs VIII form TA *nämseñc*, as per Hackstein, 1995, 68f.; as for the *m*-Part TA *nmäsmāṃ*, see now also the new attestation in YQ 10 b 2 (TA *nmäsmāṃ kapśiññā* "with bowed body"; see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 124f.); note that a third PPt stem formation TA *ñañmu* is now attested twice in YQ 10 b 5 and YQ 33 a 8 and despite its appearance as a PPt to a Pt II, the form has also intransitive meaning: *ñañmusāṃ ka(pśiñño)* and *ñañmusāṃ kapśiño* "with

bowed body"; see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 124f. and 134f. In TA, the root is attested once together with an obliquus of direction (TA *tkaṃ* 'towards the ground' in A 257 a 7; see Carling, 2000, 47f.) like synonymous ^A*räm^ᵃ*- 'bow', but in contrast to ^A*räm^ᵃ*- (which is actually only found together with TA *tkaṃ*), this root is usually construed with the allative.

Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from the root set up as PIE *√nem 'sich neigen' by ²LIV, 453f. The synonymous root ^AB*räm^ᵃ*- 'bend, bow' arguably developed out of a nasal present PT *nämnā- made from this same root that had turned into *rämnā- via dissimilation, as cogently proposed by H. C. Melchert apud Adams, DoT, 531. There is a huge number of irregularities to be observed with this root. Each of the two languages has two different remarkable PPts, one pointing to a PT *nämā/ā̊wä and another suggesting a PT *n'æn'ämäwä. As for the first of that two PPts, the root-final *-ā/å- most probably does not reflect a suffixal pre-PT *-ā-, but rather the root-final *-h₁- suggested by (most probably) cognate Gk. νέμεσις 'retribution' and νεμη- (a stem allomorph met in the paradigm of νέμω 'deal out, dispense'). The second probably synchronically belongs to a Pt II in both languages, but since TA *ñañmu* has intransitive semantics, and there are not any other kausativum forms attested in any of the two languages, it is a rather certain that PT *n'æn'ämäwä had originally belonged to the Pt III, which then itself may have started out as PT (tr) 3.sg.act. *n'æmäsā, (itr) 3.sg.mid. *n'ämä(sā)tæ with root-initial palatal. As for the depalatalization as a consequence to be assumed for the finite Pt III forms of Tocharian B, such a process had evidently occurred at least also in the Sub III, to judge from the archaic infinitive *ñmetsi*, and therefore may have been simply a root-specific trait. On the other hand, PT (tr) 3.sg.act. *n'æmäsā vs. (itr) 3.sg.mid. *n'ämä(sā)tæ (not *næm° with non-palatalizing *æ as is found in most of the other middle forms of the TB Pt III that constitute oppositional intransitives) is strongly reminiscent of historical TB (tr) 3.sg.act. Pt III *lyauksa* vs. (itr) 1.pl.mid. Pt III *lyuksamnte*, (tr) 3.sg.act. Pt III *lyautsa-ñ* vs. (itr) 3.pl.mid. Pt III *lyutstsante*. The intransitive semantics of the 3.pl.act. form of TA Prs VIII *nämseñc* is reminiscent at least of the intransitive semantics found with the 3.pl.act. TA Prs VIII *trikseñc* and the respective 1.sg.act. Pt III *trīkū* (see chap. Valency 4.5.1.1.1.).

närk- 'fernhalten, unterlassen', 'keep away, refrain from' (tr) (a/-/a)

       Prs IXb (a) -,-, *narkäṣṣäṃ*; — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub IXb — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II *narkäṣälyñe* Priv —
           Inf —
       Pt II (a) -, *ñārkastā* (MQ), *ñārka-ñ*; —
       PPt —
       Ipv II (a) -; *päñarkas*

The 3.sg. *narkäṣṣäṃ* ("Ps. oder Sub.", thus TEB I, 232, § 418 without ref.) is attested in the small fragment THT 1538 frg. a b 2: //// *(pa)lsko narkaṣṣa(ṃ)-ñ*̗ "keeps away my (sp)irit"; an MQ form *[n]ärkaṣṣaṃ* • is probably found in THT 1213 b 4; the Abstr II *narkäṣälyñe* is often attested in KVāc (see Schmidt, 1986, passim). The 2.sg. Pt *ñārkastā* is found in the MQ text THT 1540 frg. f b 3 (see Schmidt, 2007, 323), the 3.sg. Pt *ñārka-ñ* in PK AS 13D a 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; already listed in TEB II, 204 without ref.), the Ipv *päñarkas* in PK AS 17H b 2 (Pinault, 1988a, 183).
= ᴬ**närk-** 'fernhalten, unterlassen', 'keep away, refrain' (tr) (−)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *närkässi*
        Sub IX — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *närkāṣlune*
        Pt II in
        PPt *ñañärku*
        Ipv —

The PPt TA *ñañärku* is also attested in SHT 7, 1735 (reading: K. T. Schmidt). Couvreur, 1956, 76, s.v. *savāsañ* proposes the restoration of a 2.sg. Pt III TA *ñ(är)käṣt* in A 247 a 1, but Schmidt, 1983, 130 argues that one should rather restore to TA *ñ(a)käṣt* (from ᴬ*näk-* 'destroy'). TB *narkäṣälyñe* and TA *närkāṣlune* both correspond to Skt. *vairamaṇī* 'act of refraining (from sinful behavior)'. ETYM. The semantics of the respective abstract of the Gk. τόμος type *nerke*, which is 'hesitation, delay' is somehow reminiscent of that of Gk. νάρκη 'numbness'.

närs- 'drängen', 'urge' (tr) (a/-/a)

        Prs IXb (a) -,-, *narsäṣṣäṃ*; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt II (a) -,-, *ñyārsa-me*; —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

ᴬ**näsk**ᴮ?- '?' (?) (−)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —

Sub — Opt —
       Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt I in
PPt *näsko*
Ipv —

Unclear hapax in A 8 a 6; Sieg, Übers. I, 11 proposes a translation "ergraut (?)", Lane, 1947, 44 'faded'. Judging by the formation of the PPt, the root has A-character.

ᴬnätsw- 'starve' → *mätsts^(ä)-/ᴬnätsw^(ä)-* 'id.'

ᴬnitk- '?' → *ᴬnätk^(ä)-* 'hold off'

nitt^(ä)- 'zusammenbrechen', 'collapse' (itr) (a/-/a)
       Prs I/V (a) -,-, *nittaṃ*; — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub V — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf *naittatsi*
       Pt I (a) -,-, *naitta-c* (MQ);-,-, *naittāre* (MQ)
       PPt —
       Ipv —

The 3.sg. Pt *n[ai]tta-c p̤alsko* is attested in THT 3597 b 4 (MQ, cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 274: "erbebte dein Sinn"). On the present class, see the discussion in chap. Prs V 27.1.1. The Inf *naittatsi* in 370 a 3 attests to an *ā*-subjunctive stem with initial accent (although manuscripts with the signature T III M 42 hail from the western region, and not from Murtuq, as per Adaktylos et al., 2007, 41f., this one text 370 indeed looks like a Murtuq manuscript judging by the ductus, and there are no forms with MQ character to be found).

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'niederreißen', 'tear down' (tr) (a/-/a)
       Prs IXb (a) -,-, *naittäṣṣäṃ*; — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf —
       Pt IV (a) -, *naittaṣṣasta* (sic),-; —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

Eᴛʏᴍ. PT *näytw-; see Winter, 1972, 388f. = 1984, 209f. = 2005, 160f., who proposes a further connection with *naitwe* 'temple'; similarly Adams, DoT, 338.

nip- '?' (tr) (-/-/a)
>   Prs — Imp —
>   nt-Part —
>   m-Part —
>   Ger I — Abstr I —
>   Sub — Opt —
>   Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
>   Inf —
>   Pt II (a) -,-, *ñaipa;* —
>   PPt —
>   Ipv —

The form is a hapax found in the monastery record 490 b I 5f., and refers to some kind of financial transaction: *purnaśä k̑uśāneṃ nocot ñaipa taisa 6000 makte nocot k̑uśāneṃ kamate 1////* (*purnaśä* is read by Schmidt, 2000, 227). The exact meaning remains unclear, all the more because *nocot* is also a hapax. Sieg, 1950, 221 proposes the translation: "Purtaś ließ ebenfalls 6000 k̑uśāne abheben (?), er selbst holte 1(000) k̑uśāne ab"; Adams, DoT, 338 proposes '± pledge' on account of possible Iranian cognates, accepted by Cheung, 2007, 289; Winter, 2001, 135 = 2005, 524 ad 338 assumes 'fix, determine', but this scholar would now prefer 'set aside, make available' (W. Winter, p.c.). M. Peyrot (p.c.) connects the form with the noun *nep* (thus read by Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 258 contra TochSprR(B), s.v. 495 a 4) that is also attested in a business letter, though in a quite similarly unclear passage (see the discussion s.v. *kut-* 'avert, eliminate'). In the end, the form remains uncertain.

nu⁽ᵃ⁾- 'schreien', 'cry' (tr) (m/x/m)
>   Prs III (m) -,-, *ñewetär;* — Imp —
>   nt-Part —
>   m-Part —
>   Ger I — Abstr I —
>   Sub V (x) -,-, *nuwaṃ;* — Opt -,-, *nuwoytär;* —
>   Ger II — Abstr II *nūwalñe/nwalñe* Priv —
>   Inf —
>   Pt I (m) -, *nawatai* (MQ),-; —
>   PPt —
>   Ipv —

A 3.sg. Sub *nuwaṃ* is arguably attested in PK AS 7M a 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The subjunctive has persistent initial accent, the Abstr variant *nwalñe* shows deletion of the accented syllable in metrical passages. *nwau* in 342 b 7 may be a PPt of this root: *//// wän[t](r)e[ñ] no nwau [y]än pūdñakte ywau ////* "because of this thing/matter, however, having cried out he goes to the Buddha/he goes. The Buddha ..."; cf. Adams, DoT, 340, who, however, now (²DoT, s.v. *nu-* 'shave off (??)') prefers to set up a different root for both *nwau* and *nwoṣ* in H 149.316 (= IOL Toch 105) b 3 (for the reading see also s.v. *tw^ᵃ-/twās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'shine').

K<small>AUSATIVUM</small> III '(Schrei) schreien', 'shout (a shout)' (tr) (a/-/a)

        Prs IXb (a) — Imp -,-, *nūwäṣṣi* (MQ);-,-, *nuwäṣyeṃ*

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt II (a) -,-, *ñāwa;* —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

The 3.pl. Imp *nuwäṣyeṃ* is attested in PK AS 15B b 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The manuals list a 2.sg.act. Prs IXb said to be attested in Amb (= PK NS 32) b 5 based on the edition by Lévi, 1912: //// – *n[u]ṣt nūwalñe*. WTG, 254 and TEB II, 204 emend to *nust*, the lautgesetzlich outcome of pre-TB *(nä)näwäs'k'ätä. Thomas, 1965, 195, on the other hand, rather reads *nest*, i.e., the 2.sg. of *nes-* 'be' (the passage is left untranslated in the edition by Couvreur, 1955, 112).

= ^A**nu-** 'schreien, erschallen', 'cry, sound' (tr) (a+/-/a)

        Prs VIII (a+) -, *nuṣt, nuṣ;*-,-, *nuseñc* Imp -,-, *nuṣā;*-,-, *nuṣār*

                nt-Part —

                m-Part *nusmāṃ*

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt II (a) —;-,-, *ñañwār*

        PPt —

        Ipv —

S<small>EM</small>. The verb refers to both unpleasant and pleasant sounds: e.g., of music(al instruments) in A 259 a [recte b] 3; see Geng/Laut/Pinault, 2004a, 49 with fn. 96, or the voice of the Buddha. The finite forms of the TB grundverb are basically transitive, even when they are not construed in a figura etymologica with related *newe* 'cry': 224 a 3 *metär pontäṃts kärtseṣc nawatai* "[als] du freundschaftliche Gesinnung zum Heil aller gebrüllt hast" (Schmidt, 1974, 98); K 3 b 6 *yolo yāmtsi ñewetär* "brüllt, Böses zu tun" (Sieg, 1938, 13f.); *nuwoytär* in 236 frg. 1 (= THT 1478 frg. a) a 2 is without context. In TA, the Prs VIII can be either used in a figura etymologica with *naweṃ* (A 244 b 1), or absolutely (A 3 b 5 *kayurṣṣ oki nuṣ* "he roars like a bull"). In TB, the kausativum does not have a meaning different from that of the grundverb. E<small>TYM</small>. PIE *√neu̯H 'schreien, brüllen' (²LIV, 456f.); Adams, DoT, 339f. ("*neu-"). TB Prs III *ñew-* < pre-PT *nēu̯- and likewise Pt II *ñāwa* attest to a Narten behavior of the root, cf. Jasanoff, 1978, 44; Eyþórsson, 1993, 56, fn. 35.

nuk^ª- 'verschlucken, runterschlingen', 'swallow' (tr) (a/a/-)

    Prs VI (a) -,-, *nuknaṃ;* — Imp —

      nt-Part —

      m-Part —

      Ger I — Abstr I —

    Sub V (a) -,-, *naukäṃn-ne* (MQ, sic); — Opt -, *nukoyt,*-; —

      Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

      Inf —

    Pt I in

    PPt *nukowä* (MQ)

    Ipv —

The 3.sg. Opt *nukoy* listed in TEB I, 229, § 412,6 is probably only reconstructed. SEM. The manuals translate the root with 'verschlingen' on the evidence of *(nuko)yt* = Skt. *gileḥ* 'would devour' in U 20 b 6; the other passages suggest rather 'swallow', which is a reasonably good translation for Skt. *gileḥ* as well.

^A***nut^(ª)-*** 'disappear' → *naut^(ª)-* 'id.'

nusk- 'reiben, (be)drücken', 'squeeze, (de)press' (tr) (x/-/a)

    Prs IXa (x) -,-, *nuskaṣṣän-me/ñuskaṣṣäṃ;*-,-, *nuskaskeṃ |*

      nuskaskemar,-, *nuskastär;* — Imp —

      nt-Part —

      m-Part —

      Ger I — Abstr I —

    Sub II — Opt —

      Ger II — Abstr II *ñuṣṣalñe* Priv —

      Inf —

    Pt III (a) *ñauskuwa* (MQ),-,-; —

    PPt *ñeñusku*

    Ipv —

In a letter kept by the Regional Museum of Xinjiang in Ürümqi, Schmidt, 1997, 236f. reads an Inf *yno[s]si* of this root showing "umgangssprachliche Lautung" (instead of the expected Inf †*ñussi*), but since the substitution of *yn* for *ñ* and of *o* for *u* is yet unknown in the informal styles and a sound change *ñ > yn* is further phonologically problematic, this is not convincing. The initial akṣara of the Abstr *(ñ)uṣṣalñe* in H 150.45 a 4 is just a restored one, but the visible traces of the damaged akṣara indeed strongly favor palatal *ñ* and not non-palatalized *n;* see Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 254. The 1.sg. *ñauskuwa* does not belong to a Pt II (pace the manuals), but to an *s*-preterit; see Schmidt, 1985, 433f.; Kim, 2007b, 74f., fn. 20, and chap. Pt III. Beside a restored PPt *ñeñu(sku)* in H 150.46 b 4, an undamaged form is now attested in the small fragment THT 1536 frg. g a 2. ETYM. To be derived from a PIE "Iterativpräsens" *gnu(ĝ)-sk̂e/o- from a PIE root *√gneu̯(ĝ) 'drücken, schlagen, (zer)stoßen' (not in ²LIV) and not a cognate of ^A*wnisk^ª-* '± crush, torment', according to Hackstein, 1995, 183. The Sub II attests, however, rather

to the former existence of a (pre-PT) *e*-grade *-sk- present, which will have owed its *e*-grade most probably to a Narten present or a Narten preterit made from the same root; and the latter may indeed be continued by the TB Pt III showing root-initial palatalization (final -*sk*- of the Pt III being probably only an intruder from the *-sk- present).

nes- 'sein', 'be' (itr) (a+/-/-)

        Prs I + II (a+) *nesau, nest, nesäṃ/nesa-ñ/nesaṃ-ne; nesem, nescer* (S)/
            neścer (S), *nesäṃ/nesaṃ-ne;-,-, nesteṃ* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *nesamane/nesmane*
            Ger I *nesalle* Abstr I *nesalyñe*
        Sub I — Opt —
            Ger II *nesalle* Abstr II *nesalyñe* Priv —
            Inf *nestsi/ nessi*
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 1.pl. *nesem* shows a (no doubt secondary) thematic ending. *nesalle* functions both as Ger I and Ger II; see TEB I, 187, § 318,2,b, fn. 1 and § 319,1, fn. On the irregular imperfect (not listed here), see chap. Imp 15.1. The suppletive finite subjunctive stem, preterit stem, PPt, and imperative stem are provided by *tāk^a*- 'be'. There are also special copula forms, despite the fact that *nes-/^Anas-* can have the function of a copula too. Although these are possibly not cognates of *nes-/^Anas-*, I do not set up a separate lemma for them, but treat them right here: 3.sg. *ste*, with following enclitic pronoun *star-*; 3.pl. *skente*, *skentar-/stare*; a 2.sg. *star* is arguably attested in 405 a 2, cf. Batke, 1999, 20f. and Peyrot, 2008, 141, 232. As per Peyrot, 2008, 141 (with ref.), the variant *stare* is confined to eastern and colloquial documents. The etymology of *skente* is obvious: this form derives from the PIE stem *h₁s-sk̂-e/o- (most recently treated by Hackstein, 1995, 277ff.; Melchert, 2000a, 146; Ittzés, 2008, 28ff.), as already recognized by Meillet (see Watkins, 1969, 200). As for the forms with initial *st-*, for a long time it was customary to derive 3.sg. *ste*, *star-* from PIE *sth₂-o(r), and 3.pl. *stare* from PIE *sth₂-ro; see above all Watkins, 1969, 200 (with the caveat "Die 3. Pl. *stare* zeigt die Endung des Präteritum Aktiv und ist vielleicht analogisch"); Jasanoff, 1978, 15; Rose, 1980, 72f.; Adams, 1988a, 58; DoT, 345; and still Jasanoff, 2003, 52. However, Stumpf, 1990, 87ff. showed that the forms with initial *st-* can derive from "skə-te", etc. (i.e., pre-PT *sk-e-t-), with the implication that 3.sg. *ste* and *star-* can be etymologically related to 3.pl. *skente*, and this approach was then immediately adopted by many other scholars, in most detail by Hackstein, 1995, 272ff., and most recently by Peyrot, 2008, 141f. and Pinault, 2008, 642f. (with ref.); on the absence of final *-r in *ste* and *skente*, see also Hackstein, 1995, 274f., 281; Peters, 2004, 439. As for the 3.pl. variant *stare*, a proto-form starting with pre-PT *sk-e-t- is, of course, excluded in this case, so one would very much wish the (apparently rather recently created) form could be somehow explained as analogical

innovation based on 3.sg. *ste* and/or *star-* (see for such attempts above all Stumpf, Peyrot, and Pinault, ll.cc.), but it is only fair to say that one cannot get from *ste* and/or *star-* to *stare* via any kind of proportional analogy, as correctly seen by Jasanoff, 2003, 52.

= ^A***nas-*** 'sein', 'be' (itr) (a+/-/-)

       Prs I + II (a+) *nasam, naṣt, naṣ/näṃ; nasamäs, naś, neñc* Imp —

           nt-Part —

           m-Part *nasmāṃ*

           Ger I *nasäl* Abstr I *naslune*

           Inf —

       Sub I — Opt —

           Ger II *nasäl* Abstr II *naslune*

       Pt —

       PPt *nāṃtsu*

       Ipv —

The 2.pl. Prs TA *naś* is attested in, e.g., YQ 13 b 1. Precisely as the TB form *nesalle*, TA *nasäl* also functions both as Ger I and Ger II; see TEB I, 187, § 318,2,b, fn. 1 and § 319,1, fn. All Ger and Abstr forms are clearly athematic, and this is undoubtedly the original stem formation. Some forms of the finite stem clearly show thematic inflection, which can likewise be observed in TB. And just like in TB, the finite subjunctive, preterit, and imperative is supplied by ^A*tāk^ä-* 'be', and the imperfect is irregular (see chap. Imp 15.1.). Unlike TB, TA does not have special forms for the copula.

Sᴇᴍ. On the semantics, see Batke, 1999, 30ff. The root can function as copula and as a verb of existence; the 3.sg. present indicative has always the meaning "es gibt" ("there is, exists"). Eᴛʏᴍ. Either from PIE *√nes 'davonkommen, unbeschadet heimkehren' (²LIV, 454f.) or from PIE *√h₁es 'be' plus a prefixed particle *no. The first approach goes back to Meillet, 1911, 456, and since *n-* lacks palatalization, it is customary to set up pre-PT *nos-; see Pinault, 1989, 134f.; Jasanoff, 1978, 14; and more recently García Ramón, 2004, 45 and Pinault, 2008, 639; somewhat differently, Jasanoff, 2003, 74, fn. 17 and 224 rather opts for pre-PT *nēs- "with secondary depalatalization?", backing the assumption of a Narten behavior of this root by deriving the respective TA PPt *nāṃtsu* 'been' from a preform with a pre-PT root vowel *-ō- (differently on the root vowel pre-TA *ā in the proto-form starting with *nānās- Pinault, 2008, 640; maybe the form derives simply from PT *næ.næsāwä). The second analysis was essentially first proposed by Pedersen, 1941, 161, who was later followed by Watkins, 1969, 200; de Simone, 1987, 143 (who claimed that PIE *ō resulted regularly in TB *e* [!]; as for alleged Messapic *no* 'sum', see also the literature quoted in de Simone/Marchesini, 2002, 252); Klingenschmitt, 1994, 361 = 2005, 394f.; and Adams, 1994a, 17ff.; DoT, 345.

naut^(ä)- 'verschwinden', 'disappear' (itr) (-/a/a)

       Prs — Imp —

           nt-Part —

           m-Part —

Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub V (a) -,-, *nautaṃ*;-,-, *nautan-ne* Opt -,-, *nauyto-ñ* (sic);-,-, *nautoṃ*
     Ger II *nautalle* Abstr II *nautalñe* Priv *anautacce*
     Inf —
Pt I (a) -,-, *nautā-ne*;-,-, *nautare-ṃ* (MQ)
PPt *nanautau | nanautaṣ*
Ipv —

The 3.pl. Opt *(n)autoṃ* is restored in H 150.50 b 3 by Broomhead I, 265. The
subjunctive has persistent initial accent. According to Schmidt, 1997c, 566, the
Pt I derives from an old perfect of the Vedic *śrāvi* type, and also has the
semantics typical of an old perfect.

KAUSATIVUM I 'verschwinden lassen, vernichten', 'make disappear, destroy'
   (tr) (a/-/a)
   Prs IXb (a) *nautäskau*,-, *nautäṣṣäṃ*; — Imp —
      nt-Part *nautṣṣeñca* (sic)/*nautṣeñca* (Š, sic)
      m-Part —
      Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub IXb — Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
      Inf *nautästsi/nautässi/nautastsi* (MQ)
   Pt IV (a) —;-,-, *nautṣare* (Š, sic)
   PPt —
   Ipv —

A 1.sg. Prs *nau(täskau)* is restored in PK NS 48 + 258 a 4 by Pinault, 1994, 187.
On the loss of (*)*ä* in *nautṣṣeñca/nautṣeñca* and Pt *nautṣare* (attested in the
same manuscript as the *nt*-participles), see chap.s Pt IV 10.1.2.3. and Prs/Sub
IX 31.1.5.1.

~ ᴬ*nut⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'verschwinden', 'disappear' (itr) (-/m/-)
   Prs — Imp —
      nt-Part —
      m-Part —
      Ger I — Abstr I —
      Inf —
   Sub V (m) -,-, *nutātär*;— Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt I in
   PPt *nuto*
   Ipv —

A middle 3.sg. Sub TA *nutā(tär)* is restored with some certainty in YQ 19 a 5f.
(Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 192).

KAUSATIVUM I 'verschwinden lassen, vernichten', 'make disappear, destroy'
   (tr) (a/-/-)
   Prs VIII (a) -,-, *nutäṣ*; — Imp —
      nt-Part *nutṣantäṃ*
      m-Part —
      Ger I — Abstr I —

        Inf *nutässi*
    Sub IX — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *nutāṣlune*
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

ETYM. See Adams, DoT, 349 and in addition Hilmarsson, 1991, 32ff. Tocharian B seems to have used a denominative, and Tocharian A rather a primary formation.

^{A}nw^{ā}- '± dulden, leiden', '± bear, suffer' (?)
    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt I (m) -,-, *nwāt*; —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

This root is set up by Couvreur, 1956, 81, 96 (without discussion) on the evidence of TA *nwiññāt* in A 222 a 7 and TA *nwāt* in A 222 b 4 = A 239 b 5 — as edited in TochSprR(A) —, and apparently also on account of the undisputed adj. TA *nwām* 'sick'. Differently, TG, 380 suggested to read TA *n<u> wiññāt* in A 222 a 7, followed by Hilmarsson, 1991a, 86, who nevertheless accepted Couvreur's interpretation of TA *nwāt.* Hilmarsson argued with respect to A 222 a 7 that while the question cannot be decided from a semantic point of view, a Prs XII stem TA *nw-iññ-* from a root *^{A}nwā-* has to be excluded on morphological grounds, and it is certainly true that there cannot be found other Prs XII stems of a *nw-iññ-* kind in Tocharian A; on the other hand, *^{A}kñā-ññ-* does not provide a striking counterexample (see s.v. *^{A}kñā-ññ-*). As for TA *nwāt* in A 222 b 4 = A 239 b 5, TG, 422 s.v. *āk-* similarly proposed to read *n<u> wāt* in this passage, by taking TA *wāt* to be the 3.sg. Pt of *^{A}wā-* 'lead'. However, I find it hard to believe that we have a misspelling or an irregular sandhi form *nw* for *nuw* three times (even though the meter in A 222 and A 239 "scheint in beiden Fällen nicht in Ordnung", as per TochSprR(A)), and although Couvreur's analysis makes sense both semantically and morphologically — at least with respect to TA *nwāt* —, I set up *^{A}nw^{ā}-* '± suffer' at least on the evidence of TA *nwāt* and TA *nwām* 'sick'.
ETYM. On the etymology, see Hilmarsson, 1991, 34f., and note that cognate TB *onuwaññe* 'immortal' clearly goes back to a PT proto-form starting with *æ(n)nuwā-, which seems to be at variance with PT *twāsā- and *swāsā-.

P

parāk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'prosper' → *pārāk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'id.'

pāt?- '?' (?) (−)

    Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub ? — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf *patätsi* (MQ)
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

Unclear hapax in 554 a 3. Krause, WTG, 256 translates 'durchschreiten', Adams, DoT, 369 '± dam, check', both with question mark, and both suggested translations fit the context. MQ ⟨patä°⟩ can render both /pātä°/ and /pátä°/, but evidently not /°tā°/; cf Peyrot, 2008, 34f. Accordingly, one should rather follow Krause (WTG, 143, § 137), who proposed a misspelling for a kausativum of Class IXb **patästsi*. On the other hand, *patätsi* is strongly reminiscent of *lyutätär* from *lut-* 'remove' (for the rare examples of this kind, see chap. Sub II 19.1.2.). Adams, l.c., also proposed a Sub I of a grundverb from a root *pät-* or *pāt-*; actually, one could even assume a Sub II.

ᴬpāt⁽ᵃ⁾- 'pflügen', 'plough' (tr) (-/-/a)

    Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II
    Pt I (a) — ;-,-, *pātar*
    PPt —
    Ipv —

Clear hapax in A 300 a 8: //// *māk puklāyo pātar-äṃ* "... viele Jahre pflügten sie diese [scil. die Zungen]", cf. Kölver, 1965, 24. The passage clearly comes from one of the hell chapters of MSN; an exact Old Turkish parallel has not been identified so far (cf. Pinault, 1999, 205), but one can consult MaitrSäṇim XXI 4, 8ff. for this kind of infernal punishment for 'sins committed by the tongue': "Die Höllenherrscher haben sie auf den Boden geworfen, ihre Zungen herausgezogen" (which roughly corresponds to A 300 a 7), and "und mit ... eisernen Pflügen zerbrochen und umgepflügt", as translated by Geng/Klimkeit/Laut, 1998, 89. TG, 447 connects the verbal form with the noun TA *pate* that translates Skt. *kr̥ṣi* 'plowing, cultivation' in the bilingual text A

361, 2 and 3 (read *pate* instead of *pane* in TochSprR(A)). Although descriptively being a pre-PT *oi̯*-stem, this noun may ultimately reflect an *o*-grade τόμος-type abstract pre-PT *PóT-os 'plowing', and the verb may have started out as a denominative to this pre-PT *o*-stem. See also Schmidt, 2002, 8, who in addition cites a TB cognate *[p](·)to* 'Ackerbau, Pflügen' without text reference. ETYM. PIE *√bʰedʰh₂ 'stechen, graben' (²LIV, 66), as first proposed by Schneider, 1939, 249.

pātkᵃ- 'aufgeben, ablegen, loswerden', 'give up' (?) (-/a/-)
　　　　Prs — Imp —
　　　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　　　m-Part —
　　　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
　　　　Sub V (a) — Opt -,-, *pātkoy*;—
　　　　　　　Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
　　　　　　　Inf —
　　　　Pt I in
　　　　PPt in *papātkarmeṃ*
　　　　Ipv —
The Opt *pātkoy* is only listed in TEB II, 208 without ref. SEM. As per TEB II, 208. The Abs *papātkarmeṃ* translates Skt. *viśreṇayitvā* 'having given up' in H 149.add 124 (= U 25) b 3 (see Thomas, 1971, 39) and the Toch. form is also attested in the parallel text TX 4 (now = THT 1355) b 3; see Thomas, 1974, 91ff. ETYM. The root is set up as *pātkᵃ-*, not as *pätkᵃ-*, by Pinault, 2006, 110. Further connections are uncertain.

pārāk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'gedeihen', 'prosper' (itr) (a/-/-)
　　　　Prs I (a) — Imp —;-, *porośicer, porośyeṃ*
　　　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　　　m-Part —
　　　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
　　　　Sub V — Opt —
　　　　　　　Ger II — Abstr II *parākalñe* Priv —
　　　　　　　Inf *parākatsi*
　　　　Pt —
　　　　PPt —
　　　　Ipv —
According to Schmidt, 2000, 226, the forms of the imperfect are attested in 370 b 5 and 404 a 4 contra TochSprR(B), where the word separation is *po rośicer* and *po rośyeṃ*; based on the reading of TochSprR(B), WTG, 280 had set up a root *rok-* 'leuchten' (?), which is consequently a ghost root.
KAUSATIVUM I 'zum Gedeihen bringen', 'make prosper' (tr) (—)
　　　　Prs IXa — Imp —
　　　　　　　nt-Part *parākäṣṣeñca*
　　　　　　　m-Part *parākäskemane*
　　　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —

```
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
```

SEM. Instead of the meaning 'sich freuen' given by the manuals, Schmidt, 1984, 152 proposes 'prosper' on account of the Sanskrit equivalent *vṛddhiṃ* 'prosperity' in H 149.314 b 5. ETYM. As per Adams, DoT, 357.

ᴬpārs?- '?' (?) (—)
```
        Prs I/II/V — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part pārsmāṃ
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
```
Unclear hapax in A 142 a 6.

ᴬpāś- 'bitten, betteln', 'beg' (tr) (m+/-/-)
```
        Prs X (m+) pānäsmār,-, pānäṣtär;-,-, pāṃsantär Imp —
                nt-Part pāṃṣant
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf pānässi
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II
        Pt I/III in
        PPt pāpśu
        Ipv —
```
Probably the root was *ᴬpāt⁽ᵃ⁾-*: (*)*-t-* could disappear completely in front of an *-n-* in Tocharian A, and *-c(-)* could sporadically turn into *-ś(-)* in both Tocharian A (cf. TA *piś* as a variant of the 2.pl. Ipv TA *pic* from *ᴬi-* 'go') and Tocharian B (cf., e.g., Peyrot, 2008, 77f.); the PPt may have belonged to a Pt VII built on a pre-PT present stem in *-eị̯e/o-.

ᴬpās- 'protect' → *pāsk-* 'id.'

pās^a- '± sagen, flüstern', '± speak, whisper' (?) (-/a/-)
```
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
```

        Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub V (a) -,-, *pāsaṃ*; — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

Hapax in 328 b 4: | | *kattāke klautsaine [pā]saṃ (·)e////* "if the householder …
in the ears …". Note that the lower part of the akṣara ⟨pā⟩ is damaged, so one
could read ⟨p(·)ā⟩, i.e., the root may begin with a cluster. As for *(·)e*, this could
be restored to the suffixed pronoun *-(n)e* (Prātimokṣa rules generally address
a single person, so singular *-ne* is more likely than plural *-me*). Since the
preceding lines are treating Pāt 28 and Pāt 29 (cf. the commentary by
Sieg/Siegling, TochSprR(B)), line b 4 should deal with the beginning of Pāt 30
— the visible traces of the akṣara preceding the double daṇḍa is most likely a
⟨ti⟩, i.e., *(pay)ti*, being the end of Pāt 29. The Sanskrit parallel of the rule is in
translation: "Wenn ein Mönch Bettelspeise isst, die auf Veranlassung einer
Nonne zubereitet worden ist, dann ist es ein Pātayantikā-Vergehen, es sei
denn, der Herr des Hauses hat schon vorher die Initiative ergriffen" (cf. von
Simson, 2000, 292). Hence, the Tocharian passage treats the initiative of the
householder (Skt. *prāg-gr̥hi-samārambhāt-* 'on the preceding initiative of the
householder'; see von Simson, 2000, 211), and consequently the passage could
mean: "if [beforehand] the householder *speaks (out an invitation)* in (hi)s ear".
The proposal by Adams, DoT, 367 '± whisper' is hence far more convincing
than the one by WTG, 256 'blasen (?)'. D. Q. Adams (p.c.) furthermore points
out to me that *psälle* in IOL Toch 946 a 2 may also belong here: //// *ime psälle*
//// "the thought is to be uttered". In that case, we would gain an ablauting
Sub V stem from a root *päs^a-*, but note that ablauting Sub V stems without
persistent initial accent are very rare; see chap. Sub I/V 18.2.7.

pāsk- 'schützen, bewahren', '(Regeln) befolgen', 'sich hüten', 'protect', 'obey
       (rules)', 'beware of' (tr) (m+/x/m)
       Prs II (m+) *paskemar*,-, *pāṣtär*; *paskemntär* (S),-, *paskentär* Imp —
            nt-Part *paṣṣeñca*
            m-Part —
            Ger I *paṣṣalle* Abstr I —
       Sub II (x) —; *pāskem* (MQ),-,- | -,-, *pāṣtär*; —
            Opt *paṣṣīmar*,-, *paṣṣītär*;-,-,
            paṣṣīyentär
            Ger II *paṣṣalle* Abstr II *paṣṣalñe* Priv *apāṣṣätte*
            Inf *pāṣtsi/pāssi*
       Pt I (m) *paṣṣāmai, paṣṣatai* (MQ),-;-,-, *paṣṣānte*
       PPt *papāṣṣu | papāṣṣoṣ*
       Ipv I (m) -; *pāṣṣat* (MQ)

The 1.sg. Prs *paskemar* and 1.sg. Pt *paṣ(ṣ)ā(mai)* are attested in PK Cp 40-42 b 5 and b 6 (Pinault, 1994b, 102), the 3.sg. Prs *pāṣtär* in SHT 7, 1738 (= M 158.1) (reading: K. T. Schmidt). On the 1.pl. Prs *paskemntär* (not †*paskemttär*), see Peyrot, 2008, 156. The only active form is the 1.pl. Sub *pāskem* in 574 a 4 (cf. Schmidt, 1974, 27: *pāskem <m>añyeṃ* "wenn wir die Sklaven (nicht?) schützen"); the alleged 2.sg. active Opt *pāṣṣit* is due to a rather daring emendation of *pāssitwi* in 286 a 2 to *pāṣṣit twe* (cf. also Schmidt, 1974, 27f.). In S 5 (= PK AS 5B) a 1 one has to read a 1.sg.mid. Opt *[paṣ]ṣīmar* (see Pinault, 1990a, 61, contra Thomas, 1966a, 171, fn. 6). The 3.pl.mid. *paṣṣīyentär* in 508 b 3 is rather Opt than Imp, the same is true for the attestation in BM b 6 (on the evidence of the presence of *ñäke* 'now', cf. Broomhead I, 106). The 3.pl.mid. Pt *paṣṣānte* is found in PK AS 16.3 a 6 (Couvreur, 1954, 88; Pinault, 1989a, 157), and *(pa)ṣṣānte* is maybe also to be restored in THT 3597 a 7 (MQ), cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 273. Pace Broomhead I, 313, there is no 2.sg. Ipv *pāṣṣar* attested in St. 42.2.3 b 4, the form has to be read *pātärṣc*; see Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 302. The imperative "*pā(ṣṣā)t*" in H 149.148 (= U 24) b 5 is not a restored form, because Lévi, 1933 — unlike the Sieg School — uses round brackets for indicating damaged akṣaras; in fact, the akṣara ⟨ṣṣā⟩ is clearly readable; see Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 39 (the text seems to have MQ character).

= *ᴬpās-* 'schützen, bewahren', '(Regeln) befolgen', 'sich hüten', 'protect', 'obey (rules)', 'beware of' (tr) (m+/m/m)

Prs II (m+) -, *pāṣtār*, *pāṣtär*;-,-, *pāsantär* Imp —
 nt-Part *pāṣant*
 m-Part *pāsmāṃ*
 Ger I *pāṣäl* Abstr I —
 Inf *pāssi*
Sub II (m) *pāsmār*,-, *pāṣtär*;— Opt —
 Ger II *pāṣäl* Abstr II *pāṣlune* Priv in *āpāṣtune*
Pt I (m) -, *pāṣāte*, *pāṣāt*;—
PPt *pāpṣu*
Ipv I (m) *ppāṣār*; *ppāṣāc*

The 2.sg. TA *pāṣtār* is Prs or Sub; the *m*-Part TA *pāsmāṃ* has passive meaning (cf. TG, 447). The forms of the past tense are preterits, at least in all clear instances (on A 292 b 6, see Pinault, 1999, 223). TA *āpāṣtune* is attested in YQ 32 a 7 and b 3.

ETYM. PIE *-sk̂e/o- present *ph₂-sk̂e/o- from PIE *√peh₂(i) 'schützen, hüten, weiden' (²LIV, 460); see Hackstein, 1995, 174ff.

pāssᵃ- '(Haut) abziehen', 'rip off (skin)' (tr) (-/-/x)

Prs — Imp —
 nt-Part —
 m-Part —
 Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —

     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
  Pt I (x) —;-,-, *passāre-ne* | *passāmai*,-,-; —
  PPt *papāsau*
  Ipv —

The PPt *papāsausai kektsentsa* (sic) is attested in THT 3597 b 6, cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 274 "über [deinen] zerfleischten Körper". Eᴛʏᴍ. The fact that the PPt just shows one single -*s*-, and -*ss*- is only found in the finite Pt forms, may suggest that the geminate is an innovation, and due to a former (re)interpretation of finite Pt forms in *-āsā- as Pt III forms. In the end, even -*pās*- with one single -*s*- may not be original, but due to a prehistoric reanalysis of forms in *-āsā- of an old Pt III as Pt I forms, so that, e.g., the connection with Gk. σπάω 'draw, tear, pluck off or out' (deemed possible by Adams, DoT, 368) remains a quite plausible option.

päk- act. 'kochen, reifen lassen', 'cook, let ripen', mid. 'kochen, reifen', 'cook,
  ripen' (tr/itr) (x/-/-)
  Prs VIII (x) (tr/itr) -,-, *pakṣäṃ*;-,-, *paksem* | -,-, *pakṣtär*; —
    Imp —;-,-, *päkṣiyeñ-c*
    nt-Part —
    m-Part *päksemane*
    Ger I *päkṣalle* (itr) Abstr I —
  Sub III (itr) — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II *pkelñe* Priv —
    Inf —
  Pt III in
  PPt *pepeku* | *pepekoṣ*
  Ipv —

The form *pärkṣalle* in W 31 b 5 is most likely a misspelling for correct *päkṣalle*, which is very often attested in this medical manuscript (thus Filliozat, 1948 ad W 31 b 5; Broomhead I, 29 transliterates the form in question as *päkṣalle*, but the *r* is quite certain): *(ma)l[kw]ersa pa{r}kṣalle* "has to be cooked in milk". According to TEB II, 208, there is "regelrechtes *pepeku* in unveröffentlichtem Text", which can now be identified as THT 1572 a 3: //// *pepekwa oko(nta)* "ripe fruit(s)". Pace the handbooks and Saito, 2006, 480, in all attestations of alleged *papeku* the first akṣara is actually damaged (including 409 b 3), so there is no such irregular PPt to be found at all, cf. Peyrot, 2007a, 799. The obl. PPt *pepekoṣ* is attested without context in the small fragment THT 1224 b 3 (cf. Saito, 2006, 480).

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I/IV 'kochen lassen (?)', 'let cook (?)' (tr) (—)
  Prs — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

        Inf —
    Pt IV in
    PPt *pepakṣu| pepakṣoṣ*
    Ipv —

pepakṣu in Fill. Y 2 a 1 and b 4 is the equivalent of Skt. *kvathitam* (√kvath 'cook'). Formally, the PPt belongs to a preterit stem of Class IV, and the meaning can indeed be that of a *let*- causative: Fill. Y 2 a 1 *arirākkäṃmpa pepakṣu kaṣayä* "a decoction with *harītakī* (= *Terminalia chebula*) that has been let cook" (for the passage see most recently Carling, 2003a, 51f.). The form is also attested in the medical text 497 b 4 (not in WTG), and the obliquus PPt *pepakṣoṣ* in THT 1556 b 4: //// *k(a)nt(i)mpa pep(a)kṣoṣ yuṣ* "soup that has been let cook together with bread (?)". To be sure, a mere transitive meaning 'cooked' is also possible in both passages. In contrast to the PPt built to Pt IV, the PPt built to Pt III has intransitive meaning, so that the former may indeed be its transitive counterpart: 409 b 3 //// *(kᵤśa)[la]mū[l]nta p(e)pekwa* "the roots of merit (= Skt. *kuśalamūlam*) [are] ripe".

= ᴬ*päk-* 'kochen, reifen', 'cook, ripen' (itr/pass) (m/m/m)
    Prs VIII (m) (pass) — Imp —;-,-, *päkṣānt*
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Prs X (m) (itr) -,-, *päknäṣtr-äṃ;* — Imp —;-,-, *pkäṃṣānt*
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub III (itr) — Opt —
        Ger II *pkal/p ᵤkal* Abstr II *pkalune/p ᵤkalune*
    Pt 0 (m) (itr) -,-, *pakt-äṃ;*—
    PPt *pakku*
    Ipv —

The paradigm seems to belong to the TA subgroup of verbs having a transitive Prs VIII and an intransitive Prs X (cf. Schmidt, 1974, 62 with fn. 2; Hackstein, 1995, 89), the middle Imp TA *päkṣānt* of Prs VIII in A 394 a 1 is clearly passive (see Schmidt, 1974, 266: "Speisen wurden gekocht", an intransitive meaning such as "the food boiled" is excluded), whereas the Prs X Imp TA *pkäṃṣānt* in A 222 a 4 is intransitive (see Schmidt, 1974, 135), and the same is true for TA *pakt-äṃ* in A 341 a 7 despite Sieg's translation in Übers. II, 40 (see Couvreur, 1954b, 260; Schmidt, 1974, 130, fn. 1 and 1994, 130); TA *päknäṣtr-äṃ* in A 124 b 6 is unclear (cf. Schmidt, 1974, 265f.). TA *p ᵤka(lune)* in A 268 b 8 is most certainly an abstract from this root on account of the Old Turkish parallel version (see already TG, 452, where, nevertheless, a special root is set up for this form; see also Schmidt, 1994b, 265 with fn. 135), the same holds true for the similarly damaged form TA *p ᵤka(–)* in line b 5 of the same

text (Couvreur, 1956, 80 restored Ger TA *p ꭣ̣ka(l)*). The Ger TA *p ꭣ̣kal* is, in my opinion, also attested in A 20 a 3: *pñi kulypam tu p ꭣ̣kal* "you will mature into one who desires virtue" (pace Sieg, Übers. I, 24, with fn. 5, who refers the form to TB *pakw-* 'rely on, trust': "du bist dem Buddha verläßlich (?)").

Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from PIE *√pekʷ 'reif, gar machen' (²LIV, 468); see Hackstein, 1995, 89f.; Adams, DoT, 368.

A homonymous root *päk-* 'pluck (wool)' (< PIE *√pek̂ '(Wolle oder Haare) rupfen, zausen', ²LIV, 467 without Toch.) is arguably attested by °*pku* that is often found in monastery records as second member of compounds with a meaning 'plucked' referring to animals; see the discussion by Pinault, 1998, 13 with ref.; differently, Schmidt, 1997, 246, followed by Saito, 2006, 479f.; pace Saito, 2006, 481f., *pku* cannot simply be taken as an archaism reflecting an (intransitive middle) PIE root aorist of PIE *√pekʷ.

päkᵃ- 'beabsichtigen', 'intend' (tr) (m/m/m)

        Prs Xa (m) -, *päknāstar, päknāstär;-,-, päknāskentär*

                Imp -,-, *päknāṣṣitär;* —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub VI (m) *päknāmar,-, päknātär;-,-, päknāntär* Opt -,-, *päknoytär;* —

                Ger II — Abstr II *päknāñe* (M) Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt I (m) -,-, *pkāte;* —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. Prs *päknāstär* is attested in PK AS 17K b 3, the 1.sg.mid. Sub *päknāmar* in PK AS 7K b 3 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). TochSprR(B) further proposed to restore a 1.sg.mid. Sub *pä(knāmar)* in 343 b 5. The 3.sg.mid. Imp *[pä]knāṣṣitär* is found in THT 1554 b 2 (also listed in TEB I, 219, § 394,4 without ref.): //// *(bodhi)[s](a)tve weṣṣaṃ k̇ꭣce [pa]knāṣṣitar╲ [y]āmtsi cai* //// "The Bodhisattva says: what (s)he intends to do ..." (the form may also be 2.pl., thus M. Peyrot, p.c.); the 3.sg.mid. Opt *päknoytär* is attested in THT 1235 b 2. The Abstr *päknāñe* is an eastern/informal form; see Schmidt, 1986a, 641.

= ᴬ*päkᵃ-* 'beabsichtigen', 'intend' (tr) (m/m/m)

        Prs X (m) -, *päknāṣtār, päknāṣtär;-,-, päknāsantär* Imp -,-, *päknāṣāt;* —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part *päknāsmāṃ*

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf —

        Sub VI (m) — Opt -,-, *päknāśitär;* —

                Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt I (m) *pke, pkāte, pkāt;-, pkāc, pkānt*

        PPt *pko*

Ipv —

On the Opt TA *päknāśitär*, see chap. Opt 23.2.2. According to Couvreur, 1956, 78, TA *pko* in A 380 a 2 and a 3 is a PPt from this root (as suggested in TG, 448 with question mark), and not an imperative of *ᴬko-* 'destroy, kill'.

Eᴛʏᴍ. The root has A-character and is hence distinct from *päk-* 'cook'; see Hackstein, 1995, 37; probably from PIE *√(s)peḱ 'schauen, ansehen, spähen' (²LIV, 575f., without Toch.), cf. Adams, DoT, 369.

päkw- 'sich verlassen, vertrauen auf', 'rely on, trust' (tr) (m/-/-)

  Prs I (m) *pkwamar,-, paktär/pak ꞈₐtär;-,-, pkwantär*

    Imp —; *pśīyemtär,-,-*
    nt-Part —
    m-Part *pkwamane*
    Ger I *pkwalle* Abstr I —
  Prs XII (m) *pkwaññemar, pkwantar,-;* — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub I — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II *pkwalñe* Priv *empakwaccai* (MQ)
    Inf *paksi* (sic)
  Pt —
  PPt —
  Ipv —

A 1.sg. (Prs or Sub) *pkwamar* is attested in THT 1335 frg. 1 a 1. Beside the MQ form 3.pl.mid. *pkwäntär* in 255 a 1, the standard-TB form (Prs or Sub) is now attested in THT 2247 a 7. The 1.pl.mid. Imp *pśīyemtär* is found in PK AS 14B a 3, the Inf *paksi* in PK NS 54 b 4 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), and the *m*-Part in the small fragment IOL Toch 764 a 3: *p(e)rnerñe pkwamane* "relying on rank/splendor", cf. Peyrot, 2007, s.v. The (secondary) Prs XII stem is attested by the 1.sg.mid. *pkwaññemar* in IOL Toch 690 b 1 and by the 2.sg.mid. *pkwantar* in THT 1456 a 2 (M. Peyrot, p.c.).

In my opinion, the root is so far unattested in TA. The alleged Ger TA *p ꞈₐkal* 'verläßlich (?)' in A 20 a 3 (thus Sieg, Übers. I, 24, fn. 5), TA *p ꞈₐka(–)* in A 268 b 5 (cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1994b, 264: 'vertrau(enswürdig)' (?)), and the abstract TA *p ꞈₐka(lune)* in A 268 b 8 belong to *ᴬpäk-* 'cook, ripe'; see s.v. Eᴛʏᴍ. The traditional view derives the root from a *u*-extension of PIE *√(s)peḱ 'look' (→ *päkᵃ-* 'intend'); cf. Adams, DoT, 369; differently, Janda, 2000, 48, fn. 115 proposed PIE had another root *√pekᵘ denoting 'vertrauen' (followed by ²LIV, 469); according to Kümmel, ²LIV, l.c., the TB present went back to a PIE present "*pékᵘ-/pₑkᵘ-u-"; in fn. 2 he makes the additional claim that because of the preservation of *kw* in Tocharian B "muß urtoch. *pəkw-, nicht *pəkw-vorliegen, das nur aus *pek⁽ᵘ⁾-u̯- entstanden sein kann", by referring to Ringe, 1996, 42; but see Fellner, 2005, 143 and note that *-k-* must have acted as syllable onset.

pät- '?' → *pāt²-* '?'

pätk- 'give up' → *pātkᵃ-* 'id.'

pätt²- '± klettern', '± climb' (?) (−)

      Prs II — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *pättemane*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt III in
      PPt in *puttuwermeṇ*
      Ipv —

For the attestations in PK AS 13I b 1 and b 3, see WTG, 159, § 161; Couvreur, 1954, 87 reads *rämt* instead of *mtā* at the beginning of b 1; on the other hand, he seems to confirm Krause's reading of the verbal forms in question. The *m*-Part is strictly speaking ambiguous and may belong to a Prs II or a Prs III, but since a PPt of the inflectional type *-u, -uweṣ* is well attested for a subgroup of A-less roots forming a Pt III, it is reasonable to assume that *pätt-* is a root forming a paradigm with Prs/Sub II and Pt III. Etym. To be derived from a PT root **pätw-*; see Winter, 1972, 388 = 1984, 209 = 2005, 160. Consequently, Winter further derives the 3.sg. Prs TA *pätwäṣ* in A 453 b 3 which is the only instance of the TA root *ᴬpätw-* (as set up by TG, 448) from this very PT root, but admits that the fragmentary context does not give a clue on the meaning of the TA form. Although TA *pätwäṣ* is apparently a translation of the preceding Skt. verbal form, this does not help much, because the Skt. form //// *(·)ānyate* is damaged (note that one can also read *(·)ātyate*). The visible ink traces on the manuscript suggest a restoration *(p)ān/tyate*, *(ṣ)ān/tyate* or maybe *(m)ān/tyate*, all of which do not lead to any known verbal form. A second possible attestation from a TA root *ᴬpätw-* is a 3.pl. Pt TA *pätwär* found in the small fragment THT 1378 frg. g a 3 (differently, Tamai, 2007a, s.v. reads *päkwär*) that is also unclear.

ᴬpätw- '?' → *pätt²-* '± climb'

ᴬpän- '?' (?) (a/-/-)

      Prs VIII (a) -,-, *pnäṣṣ-äṃ;* — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt —

PPt —
Ipv —
Unclear hapax in A 29 b 2.

pänn̠ᵃ- 'strecken, (heraus-, hoch-)ziehen', 'stretch, pull (out, up)' (tr) (x/a/x)
  Prs II (x) -,-, *päññän-me* (MQ); — | -,-, *peññatär* (Š, sic); —
    Imp —;-,-, *päññīyeṃ*
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub V (a) -,-, *pānnaṃ*; — Opt *pannoym*,-, *pannoy*;-,-, *pannoṃ*
    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
    Inf *pannatsi*
  Pt I (x) -,-, *piñña*; — | -,-, *pännāte*; —
  PPt *pännau/pännowo* (Š)
  Ipv —
The 3.sg. Prs *päññän-me* in 253 b 2 belongs to this root, according to Adams, DoT, 370 (pace Winter, 1984a, 120 = 2005, 265). The 3.pl. Imp *päññīyeṃ* is attested in PK AS 16.6 B b 6 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). Restoration to a Ger II *pännālle* is proposed by TochSprR(B) in 418 b 4; the form is without context, but since the subjunctive stem has persistent initial accent, such a restoration is not likely. The 1.sg. Opt *pannoym* is found in PK NS 23.2 b 1 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 3.sg. Opt *pannoy* in KVāc 21 a 5: *kauc ñiś sāṅk pannoy*, which translates Skt. *avalaṃbatu maṃ saṃghaḥ* "aufheben möge mich die Gemeinde"; see Schmidt, 1986, 89. The present stem is basically thematic; see Winter, 1972, 388 = 1984, 208 = 2005, 160. Although the 3.sg. Prs *peññatär* shows a different root vocalism, the form belongs to this paradigm from a semantic point of view: 558 b 3f. *te maṃt mā ṣañ añmä kauc peññaträ mā alyeṅkäṃ sīnäṣṣäṃ* "Auf diese Weise zieht er weder sich selbst empor, noch bedrückt er andere" (see Schmidt, 1974, 314).
= ᴬ*pänw̠ᵃ-* 'strecken, spannen, ziehen', 'stretch' (tr) (x/-/a)
  Prs II (x) -,-, *pañwäṣ*;-,-, *pañweñc* | —; *pañwamtär*,-,- Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part *pañwmāṃ*
    Ger I — Abstr I —
    Inf *pañwtsi*
  Sub — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II
  Pt I (a) —;-,-, *panwar*
  PPt *pänwo*
  Ipv —
The *m*-Part is also attested in SHT 8, 1983 (reading: K. T. Schmidt).
Sᴇᴍ. Pace Adams, DoT, 370, all TB instances are intransitive: 253 b 2 *päññän-m<e>=ecce pälskontā* "he stretches forth the thoughts to them"; for 558 b 3, see above; 331 a 1 *naitwe kärkāllene släppoṣ kuntipaśaṃ wat parra pānnaṃ*

"if he [scil. a monk] pulls out a shell or a vessel sunk in a mud hole" (Winter, 2003a, 109 = 2005, 531); H 149.26/30 a 5 *tā ka ṣpä śāmnai kektseñtsa nraiṣṣi [s]l(e)mi pannoṃ ñiś eṃṣky āwiśne* "Und [schon] in diesem [meinem] menschlichen Körper mögen mich Höllenflammen ziehen bis in die Avīci[-Hölle]" (Carling, 2000, 344); 238 a 1 *(ymaimeṃ ci)mpyāsta yolyyai onolmeṃ apāyntameṃ kauc panatsi* "Du hast vermocht, die Wesen (von dem) schlechten (Weg) [und] aus den schlechten Daseinsformen hochzuziehen" (Knoll, 1996, 60); 9 b 3 *(pa)lsko pannatsiś rupne yparwe* "um den Geist zuerst auf die Gestalt zu richten" (TochSprR(B), transl., 15); 109 b 6 *wäntalyi ite [pä]nnāte karṣṣa* "he stretched the bow completely and shot"; 429 a 5 *piñña saukeṃ walāneṃ* is not too clear; Itkin, 2004, 163f. compares 429 a 5 with A 63 a 4, where TA *walānās* (obl.pl.) co-occurs with the same root. But on account of the Sanskrit parallel version (for which see Schmidt, 2004, 310), this noun has the meaning 'Girlanden', not 'tent', i.e., the passage has to be translated "he hung up *sauke* and garlands"; if this is correct, D. Q. Adams proposes (p.c.) that *sauke* may be connected with *suk?-* 'hang down' and have the meaning 'streamer'. The PPt has passive meaning: 3 b 5 *mäkte ñare tne pännowo kos sarkimpa w(o)p(o)trä* "[w]ie der hier aufgezogene Faden, wie oft er mit dem Einschlag verwebt ist" (TochSprR(B), transl., 7). ETYM. To be derived from the root set up as PIE *√(s)penh₁ 'ziehen, spannen' in ²LIV, 578f.; see Hackstein, 1995, 23 and 26f. on the question whether we are dealing with a seṭ or aniṭ root; and see also Adams, DoT, 370f. Klingenschmitt, 1982, 235 no doubt correctly set up an *o*-grade iterative present PIE *ponHu̯-éi̯e/o- > *pæn'w'æ- (see also Kim, 2007a, 54f.), but some Tocharian forms clearly point to the former existence of yet another present, viz. one with a root vowel pre-PT *e (maybe PIE *penHu-/*penuH-, which possibly was to result in pre-PT *penu̯a-, to which a new *penu̯e/o- could have been back-formed); for a possible alternative, see chap. Pt I 7.3.3. See also Ringe, 2000, 125 with fn. 13 and the ref. in Kim, 2001a, 55. Winter, 1980b, 553 = 1984, 245 = 2005, 240 discusses the preterit of this root among the group of preterits with root-initial palatalization, i.e., what I call Subclass 1; see the discussion in chap. Pt I 7.1.3.1.

ᴬpänwᵃ- 'stretch' → *pännᵃ-* 'id.'

pär- 'tragen, bringen, holen, nehmen', 'bear, wear, carry, take' (tr) (a+/-/-)
    Prs II (a+) -,-, *paräṃ;-, parcer, pareṃ* Imp —;-,-, *priyeṃ*
        nt-Part *preñca*
        m-Part *premane*
        Ger I *pralle/pärlle* (MQ) Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

kām^a- 'carry, take' (Pt, PPt), *ai-* 'give, take' (middle Sub, Opt, and Inf), and *ās-* 'bring, fetch' (Sub and Ipv) serve as suppletive roots; see WTG, 58, § 60 for *ās-* and Schmidt, 1974, 360ff. for *ai-*; on the suppletive system for the Toch. verbal forms with the meaning 'take', see in general Schmidt, 1984, 152.

= *^Apär-* 'tragen, bringen, holen, nehmen', 'bear, wear, carry, take' (tr) (m+/-/-)

  Prs II (m+) -,-, *pärtär*; *pramtär*,-, *prantär* Imp -,-, *pārat*;-,-, *pārant*
     nt-Part *prant*
     m-Part *pärmāṃ*
     Ger I *präl* Abstr I —
     Inf *pärtsi*
  Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
  Pt —
  PPt —
  Ipv —

A 1.sg. Imp TA *(pāre)* is furthermore completely restored by Sieg, Übers. II, 39, fn. 1 in A 340 b 7. *^Akām^a-* 'carry, take' provides the suppletive subjunctive stem, preterit stem, PPt, and imperative stem.

SEM. According to Schmidt, 1974, 367, "herrscht [die Bedeutung] 'tragen' im Präsensstamm, 'nehmen' dagegen in den übrigen Stämmen vor". ETYM. PIE *√b^her 'tragen, bringen' (²LIV, 76f.); see Adams, DoT, 371. On the question of the development of *b^her-e/o- to TB *pär-*, see chap. Sound Laws 1.7.

pärk- 'fragen, bitten', 'ask, bring up a question, ask for, beg' (tr) (x/a/x)

  Prs VIII (x) *preksau-ś*, *prekṣt*, *prekṣäṃ*;-,-, *prekseṃ*
     Imp -,-, *prekṣi-ne*;-,-, *prekṣiyeṃ* | -,-, *prekṣītär*;—
     nt-Part —
     m-Part *preksemane*
     Ger I *prekṣalle* Abstr I —
  Sub I (a) *preku*,-, *prekäṃ-ne*;-,-, *parkän-me* Opt -, *parśit*, *parśi-ne*;—
     Ger II *parkälle* Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf *parktsi*
  Pt III (x) *prekuwa*,-, *preksa*;-,-, *prekar* | —;-,-, *parksante-ne*
  PPt *peparku* | *peparkoṣ*
  Ipv III (m) -; *parksat*

On the ablauting 3.pl. Sub *parkän-me* in 7 a 2, see Winter, apud WTG, 119, fn.; Schmidt, 1974, 54, fn. 1; ²TochSprR(B), 151 (incorrectly Couvreur, 1954, 85). The Inf *parktsi* is attested in the Berlin monastery record THT 1574 that is published in TEB II, 74 (older signature = X 369). The 1.sg. Pt *prekuwa* is found in KVāc 24 a 5 (see Schmidt, 1985, 433 and 1986, 56).

= *^Apärk-* act. 'bitten', 'ask for, beg', mid. 'fragen', 'ask, bring up a question'
     (tr) (x/m/x)
  Prs VIII (x) *praksam*,-,-;-,-, *praksenc* | *prakäsmār*,-, *prakäṣtär*;—
     Imp —
     nt-Part *prakṣäntāñ*
     m-Part —

        Ger I *prakṣäl* Abstr I —
        Inf *prakässi*
    Sub I (m) *pärkmār,-,-;-, pärkcär, pärkäntär* Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *pärklune*
    Pt III (x) *prakwā,-, prakäs;—* | *-,-, präksāt/pärksāt;-,-, präksānt*
    PPt *papräku*
    Ipv III (m) *ppärksār, ppärksāc*

The 3.pl. Prs TA *praks[e]ñc* is attested in SHT 8, 1983 (reading: K. T. Schmidt). In TA, the meanings 'ask, bring up a question' and 'ask for, beg' are confined to the middle and to the active forms of the finite verb respectively, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 376ff., but note that non-finite forms can have both meanings. According to Hilmarsson, 1991a, 72, a subjunctive stem of Class VII is to be supposed in addition on account of TA *pärkñäm*, which seems to be a verbal adjective (or nomen agentis) derived from such a stem.

ETYM. PIE *√preḱ 'fragen' (²LIV, 490f.); see Hackstein, 1995, 73ff.; Adams, DoT, 371f. According to Hackstein, the PT æ-grade of the present stem has been analogically introduced from the preterit. On the question of the respective PIE aorist, see Klingenschmitt, 1982, 62; Hackstein, 1995, 75f.; and (quite differently) Jasanoff, 2003, 175ff.

pärkᵃ- 'aufgehen', 'verständlich werden', '(a)rise', 'become clear' (itr) (-/x/a)
    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V (x) —;-,-, *pärkaṃ-me* (sic) | *-,-, pärkātär;—*
        Opt -,-, *pärkoytär-ñ;—*
        Ger II — Abstr II *pärkālñe* Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt I (a) -, *pärkasta* (MQ), *parka;—*
    PPt *pärkau* (MQ)/*pärkawo* (Š)
    Ipv I (m) *parkar;-*

The 3.pl. Sub *pärkaṃ-(m)e* (sic) is attested in PK AS 16.2 b 6, the 3.sg.mid. Opt *pärkoytär-ñ* in Ot 6B b 1 (Couvreur, 1954, 85; Schmidt, 1974, 275), and the 3.sg.mid. Sub in the MQ text THT 1321 b 4: m̲akte kau̲na parkā̲tra la̲kᵤtse "thus the sun will/would rise brightly". Pace Couvreur, *parkän-me* in 7 a 2 belongs to *pärk-* 'ask'; see above s.v. *pärk-* 'ask'. *parkar* in 556 a 2 is rather an Ipv (thus WTG, 258) than a 3.pl. *s*-preterit (thus Sieg/Siegling, TochSprR(B), glossary, 138) — although the direct context of the form is unclear — this text shows a couple of imperative forms, and, what is more, an *s*-preterit stem (NB: wit a root vowel pre-TB *-ā-!) would be extremely odd from a morphological point of view. The second member of compound °*pirko* 'rising (of the sun)' may attest to a Pt I stem with palatalizing *ä, i.e., a pre-PT *e*-grade (see Klingenschmitt, 1994, 314 = 2005, 356, fn. 6, and the discussion in chap.s Sound Laws 1.7. and Pt I 7.1.3.1.).

= *Apärk^a-* 'aufgehen', 'verständlich werden', '(a)rise', 'become clear'

        (itr) (m/-/a)
        Prs III (m) -,-, *pärkatär;* — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *pärkamāṃ*
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I (a) -,-, *pärkā-ci;-,-, parkar*
        PPt *pärko*
        Ipv —

For the second member of compound TA °*pärkānt*, see chap. Prs Part 36.2.2.
Sem. The original meaning is 'rise (of heavenly bodies)', also attested in
nominal forms; see Winter, 1988, 776ff. = 2005, 330ff. Etym. PIE *√bʰerǵʰ 'hoch
werden, sich erheben' (²LIV, 78f.); see Adams, DoT, 372f. and cf. chap. Pt I
7.3.3.

pärs^a- act. 'versprengen, besprengen (tr)', 'sprinkle (tr)', mid. 'spritzen (itr)',
        'spray (itr)' (tr/itr) (a/x/x)
        Prs VI (a) —;-,-, *parsnān* (MQ) Imp —;-,-, *pärsnoṃ*
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *pärsnālle* Abstr I —
        Prs VII (x) -,-, *prantsäṃ;* — Imp -,-, *präntsitär* (S, sic); —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *pärsatsi*
        Pt I (x) —;-,-, *pirsāre* | -,-, *pärsāte;* —
        PPt *pärsau*
        Ipv —

Ger I *[pä]rsnālle* has to be read in Fill. M 3 b 7 and *[pä]rsnāllona* in Fill. W 42 a
4, according to Sieg, 1955, 78 and 83. Note the Imp *präntsitär* (S) with -*änts*-
instead of expected †-*āṃṣ*-. An Inf *pärsatsi* is only listed in TEB II, 209, a PPt
pärsau only in TEB I, 240, § 433. WTG, 259 restores a Sub IX Inf *pirsässi* in S 8
b 1 (= a 3; see Thomas, 1966a, 179), but according to Thomas, l.c., with fn. 5, it
has to be read *[ṣi]s(s)i* (→ *si-* 'drain') instead. It is quite conceivable that one
has to emend a 3.sg. Pt *pärsāte* in 88 (= THT 1924) a 3 (written *märsane*), as
suspected by TochSprR(B), cf. Schmidt, 2001, 317 with fn. 96; for the passage,
see also Pinault, 2004a, 259f.: "es spritzte Schlamm auf von der Erde". Adams,
DoT, 416 separates the Prs VII synchronically and sets up a special stem
pränts- for it, which, nevertheless, diachronically is a nasal present of *pärs-*;
but I think a synchronic separation is not really necessary, because a Prs VII

occurs beside a Prs VI also in the case of other roots, and the semantics and the valency are also the same: the intransitive valency of the Imp *präntsitär* in 107 a 1 can be due to the middle voice (like with *pärsāte* discussed above): *mā no nta totka rano parna präntsitär* "aber auch nicht ein bißchen spritzte heraus"; see Schmidt, 2008a, 321 and Pinault, 2008, 118. In contrast, the active Prs VII form *prantsäṃ* in 18 b 5f. is transitive: *(ku)ñci(t) kuñcit mīsa prantsäṃ toṃ nraintane śāllāntäts* "Sesam[tropfen?] für Sesam[tropfen?] bespritzt in solchen Höllen das Fleisch der Zänkischen"; see Winter, 2001, 136 = 2005, 525 ad 416; differently Adams, DoT, 464: "sesame[-sized piece by] sesame[-sized piece his] flesh spattered in those hells"; it actually forms an equation with *ᴬpris-*; see s.v.

= *ᴬpärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'versprengen', 'sprinkle, spray' (tr) (-/-/a)

> Prs — Imp —
> > nt-Part —
> > m-Part —
> > Ger I — Abstr I —
> > Inf —
>
> Sub — Opt —
> > Ger II — Abstr II —
>
> Pt I (a) —;-,-, *prasar*
> PPt *pärso*
> Ipv —

The PPt TA *(pä)rsos* is, in my opinion, also to be restored in A 278 a 8; see below and s.v. *ᴬräṣ- * 'stretch (out)'.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ III 'besprengen', 'sprinkle, water' (tr) (m/-/a)

> Prs VIII (m) -,-, *pärsäṣtär;*— Imp —
> > nt-Part —
> > m-Part —
> > Ger I — Abstr I —
> > Inf —
>
> Sub — Opt —
> > Ger II — Abstr II —
>
> Pt II (a) -,-, *papärs;-,-, papärsār*
> PPt —
> Ipv —

TA *pärsāt* in A 340 b 7 (analyzed as being unclear in TG, 449) has to be emended to TA *pär<k>sāt* 'he asked', as per Sieg, Übers. II, 39, fn. 2.

Sᴇᴍ. The TB middle is intransitive, the active transitive; see Schmidt, 1974, 131f., whereas the only attestation of a TA middle in A 259 a [recte b] 3 is passive; see Schmidt, 1974, 226, and for the passage also Geng/Laut/Pinault, 2004a, 49f. The TA kausativum does not have causative semantics, but nevertheless the use seems to be somewhat different from that of the grundverb. The one attested finite grundverb form is only construed with 'water': A 63 a 3 *prasar wräntu* 'they sprinkled water' (cf. Schmidt, 2004, 310); the PPt in A 174 b 1 is without context; in A 278 a 8 one can, in my opinion, furthermore restore TA *(pä)rsos* (fem.) on account of the Old Turkish parallel

version, cf. Pinault, 1994c, 387 (who, in contrast, proposes a restoration TA *(rä)rsos*): A 278 a 8 //// *(pä)rsoss oki puk sām wartsi kātkmāṃn tāk* "like spraying (the taste of the elixir of life), the whole crowd rejoiced". In contrast, the kausativum refers to the object TA *wär* on the one hand and is in addition construed with the perlative TA *āyäṃtwā*, denoting 'spray water over the bones' (attested a couple of times in A 12); a perlative is also found in A 89 a 3: //// *(tka)nā wär papärsār* "they sprayed water on (the ground?)" (restoration according to W. Winter, p.c.); on the other hand, the passive construction in A 259 a 4 is construed with an instrumental: *pärsäṣtär tkaṃñkät snumṣiṃ swaseyo* "Besprengt wird die Erde mit einem Wohlgeruchsregen" (see Geng/Laut/Pinault, 2004a, 49f.). In TB, both of these uses are attested for the transitive active: Prs VI in 121 a 6 *wär ... parsnān* "they sprinkle water", Pt I in 45 a 3 *pirsāre keṃ* "they sprinkled the ground". Etym. PIE *√pres 'spritzen' ([2]LIV, 492f.); see Adams, DoT, 375. Cf. also [A]*pris-* '± sprinkle'.

pärsk[(ä)]- 'sich fürchten', 'be afraid' (itr) (a/a/a)

      Prs V (a) *prāskau, prāskat, prāskaṃ;-,-, parskaṃ* Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I *parskalle* Abstr I —
      Sub V (a) *prāskau,-, prāskaṃ;* — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II *pärskalñe* (MQ) Priv —
          Inf —
      Pt I (a) -,-, *pärska* (MQ);-,-, *pärskāre*
      PPt *pärskau/pärsko[⌃u] | pärskoṣ/pärskoṣä* (sic)
      Ipv —

The 1.sg. *prāskau* that is attested three times in the graffito 298 is Sub not Prs (Pinault, 2008, 16f.). The 3.sg. *prāskaṃ* in K 3 b 5 is taken as subjunctive in the translation by Sieg, 1938, 13. On the ablaut of the Prs V, see chap. Prs V 27.1.1. Thomas, 1952, 32 analyzes *parskallona* in 14 b 1 as Ger II (thus also TEB I, 228, § 412,2), but Ger I (thus WTG, 259) makes more sense. The more archaic PPt variant *pärsko[⌃u]* is attested in THT 1305 a 4.

Kausativum I 'erschrecken', 'frighten' (tr) (x/-/-)

      Prs IXb (x) —;-,-, *parskäskeṃ| -,-, parskästär;* — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub IXb — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf *parskässi*
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs *parskäskeṃ* is attested in PK AS 7A a 4 (unpublished piece of K 1, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the middle *parskästär* in the small fragment THT 1419 frg. g a 1: //// • *yolaiñesa parskastra kartsauñe* //// (also

cited by Schmidt, 1974, 506 with the signature Z 547), and the same form *(pa)rs(kä)s(trä)* can be restored in PK NS 70 b 4; the Inf is found in the same line (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

= ᴬ*pärsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sich fürchten', 'be afraid' (itr) (m/-/a)

        Prs III (m) *praskmār,-, praskatär;-,-, praskantär* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *praskmāṃ*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
        Sub V — Opt —
            Ger II *präskāl/pärskāl* Abstr II —
        Pt I (a) -,-, *pärsäk;*—
        Pt III (a) *prasku,-,-;*—
        PPt *pärsko*
        Ipv —

TA *prasku* in A 230 b 3 is analyzed as intransitive 1.sg. active of an *s*-preterit by Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 53 = Winter, 2005, 437; see also chap.s Valency 4.5.1.1. and Pt III 9.1.2.1.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'erschrecken', 'frighten' (tr) (—)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *pärskäsmāṃ*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The form is attested without context in the small fragment THT 1382 frg. i b 1; a kausativum paradigm is set up for morphological reasons.

Eᴛʏᴍ. Traditionally, this root is compared to Go. *faurhts* 'fearful', etc., so that the Germanic forms and the Tocharian root must be derived from a PIE root *√prek̂/k or *preĝ/g 'be afraid' (²LIV, 491: *√preK), the *-sk̂e/o-* present *pr̥K-sk̂e/o-* of which clearly was the starting point for the Toch. root; see Hackstein, 1995, 192ff. As for the PT æ-vocalism of the present and subjunctive stem in TB and of the present stem in TA, Rasmussen, 1996 = 1999, 616f. suggests analogical influence from a lengthened-grade sigmatic aorist stem *prēk̂-s- (which may also be reflected by the unusual intransitive Pt III TA *prasku*).

päl- '(Ohren) spitzen, lauschen', 'listen closely, prick up (one's ears)'

        (tr) (-/m/-)
        Prs VIII in °*pälṣi* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —

    Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub I/II (m) -,-, *piltär*, — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
    Inf —
 Pt —
 PPt —
 Ipv III (a) -; *pepīltso*

For the analysis of the present stem and the imperative, and for the semantics, I follow Winter, 1962, 121 = 1984, 139 = 2005, 79. *pepīltso* in 3 b 4 was emended to an obliquus PPt *pepīltso<ṣ>* by TochSprR(B), transl., 7, fn. 4 (followed by WTG, 185 and 262), but Winter, l.c., no doubt correctly interprets *pepīltso* as imperative form. A present stem of Class VIII is implied by the second member of compound *°pälṣi* found in H 149.X.3 (= HMR 1) a 4: *klausa-pilṣi* '± pricking up one's ears' = Skt. *tūṣṇīm upaśrutikaḥ* "listening secretly, sneaking"; cf. 16 b 2 *(klaut)sa-pälṣi* (cf. TochSprR(B), transl., 28, fn. 1). Second members of verbal governing compounds with the suffix *-i* are exclusively formed to roots without A-character; see Malzahn, in print. A parallel to H 149.X.3 is now furthermore provided by the Berlin fragment THT 1543 frg. g a 2 (MQ): //// *[tsa] klautsa piltra* //// (we are dealing with Pāt 75), cf. also Saito, 2006, 483 (who cites this text by its older signature). The Sub evidently had a pre-PT root vowel *e and may have undergone depalatalization of root-final *-l'- before -*t*-, as has been the case in *kaltär* from *käly-* 'stand'. Finally, the Inf *pältsi* in the far from clear passage 118 a 2 (MQ) may be the expected Inf from this Sub I/II stem, but this analysis is not really supported by the context (for *pältsi*, see also s.v. *pält²-* 'drip').

päl²- 'loben, preisen', 'praise' (tr) (m/m/m)
  Prs VI (m) *pällāmar*,-, *pällātär*;-,-, *pälläntär* Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part *pällāmane*
    Ger I *pälalyu* (MQ) Abstr I —
  Sub V (m) *pālamar*,-,-;-,-, *pāläntär* (sic, Š) Opt *pāloymar*,-,-; —
    Ger II — Abstr II *pālalñe* Priv —
    Inf —
  Pt I (m) *palāmai, palātai, palāte*;-,-, *palante* (MQ)
  PPt *papālau | papālaṣ*
  Ipv —

The *m*-Part *pällāmane* is attested in PK NS 43 b 2 (Thomas, 1972, 164). The form *pālatai-ne* in 296 b 1 does not have any linguistic value; TochSprR(B) judged the text as being "sehr fehlerhaft", which is not surprising, because the manuscript has now, in fact, been carbon-dated to the 12/13th cent. (see Tamai, 2005). The subjunctive has persistent root-initial accent. The obliquus PPt *papālaṣ* is attested in PK AS 4A a 1 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

= ᴬ*päl*ᵃ- 'loben, preisen', 'praise' (tr) (m/m/m)

        Prs VI (m) —; *pällāmtär*,-, *pällāntär* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *pällātsi*
        Sub V (m) —;-,-, *pālantär* Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *pāllune*
        Pt I (m) -,-, *pālat*,-,-, *pālant*
        PPt *pāplu*
        Ipv —

TA *plāntä* in A 359, 28 is interpreted as a metrically shortened form of TA *pällāntä* by Couvreur, 1956, 80: TA *talkeyäntu tosäm plāntä* "they praise these sacrifices". Although this analysis makes good sense, a connection with a root ᴬ*plā-* (as per TG, 453f.) cannot be excluded (see below s.v. ᴬ*plā-*).
Sᴇᴍ. Note that the middle can also have passive function, e.g., TA *pällāmtär* in A 15 a 2 ("we are praised"), cf. Schmidt, 1974, 245. Eᴛʏᴍ. PIE *√(s)pelH 'öffentlich sprechen' (²LIV, 576); see Adams, DoT, 376f.

ᴬ*päl*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'erlöschen', 'come to extinction' (itr) (m/-/-)

        Prs III (m) -,-, *platär*,— Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

TA *plont* in A 403 b 1 may be the PPt of this root (thus TG, 450), but due to the fragmentary context this cannot be proven.
Aɴᴛɪɢʀᴜɴᴅᴠᴇʀʙ/Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ 'löschen', 'extinguish' (tr) (a/-/a)

        Prs VIII (a) -,-, *pläṣ*;— Imp —
                nt-Part *pälṣant*
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt III (a) -, *palyäṣt*,-;—
        PPt *paplu*
        Ipv —

The Pt III belongs to what I call antigrundverb, whereas one cannot decide whether the Prs VIII goes back to an *s*-present or to an *sk*-present (and hence to a kausativum paradigm).

pälk- 'leuchten, glänzen', 'shine' (itr) (a/-/a)

        Prs I (a) -,-, *palkäṃ;—* Imp -,-, *palyśi/pälśi* (MQ);-,-, *pälśyeṃ* (MQ)

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt I (a) -,-, *pälka* (MQ);-,-, *pälkāre*

        PPt —

        Ipv —

The 3.sg. Imp variant *palśi* (MQ) is attested in THT 1179 frg. a b 3 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.), the 3.pl. Pt *pälkāre* in PK AS 17D a 1 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

KAUSATIVUM I 'erleuchten', 'zeigen', 'illuminate', 'show' (tr) (-/-/a)

        Prs IXb — Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part *palkäskemane*

                Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt II (a) -,-, *pyālka;—*

        PPt —

        Ipv —

The *m*-Part *palkäske(mane)* can be restored in IOL Toch 766 a 1 (Peyrot, 2008a, 110). The existence of a 2.sg. Prs (IXa or IXb) *pälkastar* laying behind *p'lk'st'r* in Man.Bil. 17 (= U 100, v. 2) is questionable; see most recently Pinault, 2008a, 98f., who prefers a reading *ṣ lkāstar* as proposed by Thomas, 1960, 150.

= ^A*pälk-* 'leuchten, glänzen, erscheinen', 'shine, appear' (itr) (a/-/a)

        Prs I (a) -,-, *pälkäṣ;-,-, pälkiñc* Imp -,-, *pälśā;—*

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt I (a) -,-, *pälk;—*

        PPt —

        Ipv —

The subjunctive stem set up in the glossary in Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 273 has to be a misprint, because all analyzable attestations of TA *pälkäṣ* in YQ are present forms.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'erleuchten', 'zeigen', 'illuminate', 'show' (tr) (m/-/-)

        Prs VIII (m) -, *pälkäṣtär,-;—* Imp —
               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I — Abstr I —
               Inf —
        Sub IX — Opt —
               Ger II — Abstr II *pälkāṣlune*
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. Schmidt, 1974, 186ff., 1997c, 544f. claims that ᴬ*pälk-* 'shine' and ᴬ*pälkᵃ-* 'see' are not "zwei selbständige Verben", but show voice alternation between an "objektives Aktiv" and "subjektives Medium"; but see the discussion in chap. Voice 5.2.2.2. Eᴛʏᴍ. PIE *√bʰleĝ/g denoting 'glänzen' according to ²LIV, 86f., but see Hackstein, 1995, 112f. with fn. 15 for the claim that the PIE root *√bʰleg already had the meaning 'brennen, leuchten', "wobei der Vorgang 'brennen' die Grundbedeutung und dessen Wirkung bzw. optische Begleiterscheinung 'leuchten' Nebenbedeutung ist".

pälkᵃ- 'sehen, erblicken', '(auf)blicken', 'see, look at', 'look (up)' (tr) (-/a/x)

        Prs — Imp —
               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V (a) *pālkau,-, pālkaṃ; palkam,-,-* Opt —
               Ger II — Abstr II *palkalñe*
               Priv *empalkaitte/empālkatte* (MQ)
               Inf *palkatsi*
        Pt I (x) -, *pälykāsta, palyka;-,-, pälykāre/pilykār* (S) | -,-, *pälkāte;—*
        PPt *pälkau| pälkowwa| pälkoṣ*
        Ipv I (x) *pālka; palkas| palkar;-*

läk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'see, look' provides the suppletive present stem. There exists an *m*-Part *päl[k]āma[ne]* attesting to a present stem made from this root in PK NS 40 (= FK 590) b 5 according to Sieg apud Couvreur, 1948, 328: //// *[ta]rśauna päl[k]āma[ne]* ////, which is rendered as "bedrog ziende" by Couvreur. However, in my opinion, a reading *päl[w]āmane* "lamenting deceit (plural in Toch.)", i.e., a form of *pälwᵃ-* 'lament' is more plausible (cf. the facsimile apud Van Windekens, 1940, Tab. IV; a look at the original manuscript also clearly suggests ⟨lwa⟩ instead of ⟨lka⟩). A middle Sub may be attested in THT 1311 b 6 if one is willing to accept the irregular syncope of the accented (!) root vowel (a separation into *sap lkāntär* is not to be preferred because *sap* would be a yet unknown word): *k̑ucesa plkāntar̩ toṃ [riṃ] no* //// (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.) "But how are the cities to be seen/visible (?)". The 1.pl. Sub is attested in PK AS 16.8 b 3 (unpublished, reading according to Pinault, p.c.): *palkaṃ̩ rī* ////

"we will see the city"; the 2.sg. Pt *palykāsta* in the small fragment THT 1604 frg. g a 1 is without context. The regular 3.pl. Pt *pälykāre* is found in PK NS 113 a 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.); on the 3.pl. variant *pilykār*, see chap. Pt I 7.2.1. The nom.pl. PPt *pälkowwa* can be found in PK AS 6C (= Ud 2) a 5f.: *wraṃtse stmānma* [6] *(tr)[oṅka]nma pälkowwa m=ānaiśai tākaṃ* "wenn die Dachrinnen und (Abfluß)löcher nicht genau gesehen werden" (reading and translation according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

= ᴬ*pälkᵃ-* 'sehen', 'see' (tr) (-/m/m)

> Prs — Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
>> Inf —
>
> Sub V (m) *pälkāmār, pälkātār, pälkātär;-,-, pälkāntär*
>> Opt -, *pälkītār,-; —*
>> Ger II *pälkāl* Abstr II *pälkālune*
>
> Pt I (m) *pälke, pälkāte, pälkāt;-,-, pälkānt*
> PPt *pälko*
> Ipv I (m) *pälkār; pälkāc*

ᴬ*läk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'see, look' provides the suppletive present stem. Diachronically, the middle Imp forms TA *pälkār* and TA *pälkāc* probably belonged to ᴬ*pälkᵃ-*, but synchronically they were rather taken for forms from ᴬ*läk⁽ᵃ⁾-*, as per Schmidt, 1974, 22f., fn. 4, because in Tocharian A all other imperative forms from roots starting with a *p-* show synchronically *pp-*.

SEM. In TB, the verb is basically transitive, but it can also be used absolutely: 365 a 5 *(pa)lyka tän̄wsa no keᵤcä katkemane pū(d)ñ(ä)ktememṃ ṣamāññe ot rītāte* "[m]it Liebe sah er aber auf, erfreut, [und] erstrebte alsdann das Mönchtum vom Buddha"; see Schmidt, 1974, 151; cf. also Winter, 2001, 135 = 2005, 524 ad 377. In contrast to TB, in TA the verb is mostly construed with the allative; see the examples in Kölver, 1965, 89; in addition, there are also attestations with an obliquus: A 12 a 3 *āyäntu kāklon̄cäs pälkānt* "they saw broken bones (of a lion)", cf. Sieg, Übers. I, 15. The same is true for the suppletive root ᴬ*läk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'see, look'. Whether the Priv *empalkaitte*/ TA *apälkāt* 'unheeding, unconcerned, unworried' is derived from this root (thus the analysis of WTG, 43) or rather from *pälk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'burn' (preferred by Hilmarsson, 1991, 70 for semantic reasons) is still a matter of discussion. From a semantic point of view, a development 'without sight' → 'without consideration' (cf. ModHG 'rücksichtslos') does not seem implausible to me; see also chap. Priv. ETYM. As above s.v. *pälk-* 'shine'; according to Hackstein, 1995, 112f. with fn. 15, the semantic development to 'see, look' was the consequence of a "semantische Angleichung" to the suppletive root *läk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'see, look'.

pälk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'brennen', 'burn' (itr) (m/-/-)

> Prs III (m) -,-, *pälketär-ne;* — Imp —
>> nt-Part —

          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'verbrennen, quälen', 'burn, torment' (tr) (x/m/x)

      Prs VIII (x) -,-, *pälkṣäṃ* (MQ); — | -,-, *palkṣtär*; — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub II (m) — Opt -,-, *palyśitär* (sic); —
          Ger II — Abstr II *pälyśalñe/pilycalñe* Priv —
          Inf —
      Pt III (x) *pelykwa*,-, *pelyksa*; — | -, *palyksatai*,-; —
      PPt *pepalykusai* | *pepälykoṣ* (MQ)
      Ipv —

The 3.sg. Pt *pelyksa* is found in THT 1131 frg. j a 2 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). The root vowel of *p(·)lyks(a)t(ai)* in 83, 1 has to be restored as *(a)*, not *(e)*, for morphological reasons; see Hackstein, 1995, 11, fn. 6 with ref.; the 3.sg. *pelyksate* cited in TEB I, 177, § 301,3 without ref. is probably merely based on such an incorrect restoration. The middle forms of the antigrundverb are either passive (*palkṣträ* in 14 b 3; see Schmidt, 1974, 211; differently ²TochSprR(B), 165; similarly *palyksatai* in 83, 1), or direct-reflexive (*palyśitär* in 20 b 2, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 314). The obl. PPt *p[e]pälykoṣ* is attested without context in the small fragment THT 1540 frg. j b 1 (MQ); see Schmidt, 2007, 330.

= ᴬ*pälk⁽ᵃ⁾?-* 'verbrennen, quälen', 'burn, torment' (tr) (a/-/m)

      Prs VIII (a) —;-,-, *pälkseñc* Imp -,-, *pälkṣā*; —
          nt-Part *pälkṣant*
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf *pälkässi*
      Sub II — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II *pläślune/pälyślune/pälślune*
      Pt II (m) *papälyke*,-, *papälykāt*; —
      PPt *papälyku*
      Ipv —

ETYM. As above s.v. *pälk-* 'shine'; according to Hackstein, 1995, 112f. with fn. 15, the Sub II continues the subjunctive of a PIE root present, Prs VIII being an inner-Tocharian creation built to match the Pt III, which he says continues a PIE *s*-aorist: *bʰlēg- > pre-TB *plyek-, attested *pelyk-* being analogically reshaped in order to match *pälyk-* (from *bʰleg-) and *pälk-* (from *bʰl̥g-); but *pelyk-* may derive from a schwebeablaut variant *bʰelg- > PT *p'ælk- as well;

see chap. Sound Laws 1.7. Kim, 2007, 190 derives the Sub II from a PIE root aorist subjunctive.

pält?- 'tröpfeln', 'drip' (tr) (−)

      Prs IXb − Imp −

          nt-Part −

          m-Part −

          Ger I *paltäṣle* (M)/ *pältäṣäle* (MQ) Abstr I −

      Sub − Opt −

          Ger II − Abstr II − Priv −

          Inf −

      Pt −

      PPt −

      Ipv −

A look at the manuscript confirms the reading *paltä[ṣle]* in 324 b 2. In the very archaic, medical MQ text bi 41 b 2 one can furthermore read: //// *ya̱maṣalle seka melenne palta̱ṣa[l]e* //// "... has to be done; this has to be dripped into the nose" (this fragment that is part of the Berlin Middle Iranian manuscript collection belongs to the medical manuscript THT 2668ff. and was identified by D. Maue apud Sander, in print). Whether *pältsi* in 118 a 2 (MQ) is an infinitive of the grundverb of this root is entirely uncertain, because the context does not support a meaning 'to drip'; see Krause, WTG, 122, § 120, fn. 6; an alternative is analysis as Inf of the root *päl-* 'listen closely'.

= ^A***pält^B?-*** '± tropfen', '± drop' (itr) (-/-/m)

      Prs − Imp −

          nt-Part −

          m-Part −

          Ger I − Abstr I −

          Inf −

      Sub − Opt −

          Ger II − Abstr II −

      Pt I (m) -,-, *pältāt;* −

      PPt −

      Ipv −

SEM./ETYM. The TA form is a hapax found in A 153 b 6; Couvreur, 1956, 71 assigns the meaning 'dropped' to it. The actual reason for Couvreur to do so, and for the manuals to assume a meaning 'drop, drip' for the TB verb as well, is the noun TB *pältakw*/TA *piltäk*, which beyond doubt has the meaning 'drop'. Adams, DoT, 379 writes this noun is a derivative of the verbal root "with the concrete nominalizer *-äkw*"; unfortunately, there is no further evidence for such a Tocharian nominal suffix (*pässakw*/TA *pässāk* 'garland' clearly being a borrowing from Iranian), but Adams' analysis of the noun is nevertheless quite reasonable. A meaning 'drop' also makes sense for the one TA instance and for *paltäṣle* in the medical text 324 b 2: //// *paltäṣle cau ṣe ṣ śār kutär ot sark wa* //// "... this has to be dripped, and one (drop?) will be poured over it, and the illness ...". Whether *pältsi* in 118 a 2 (MQ) is an

infinitive of the grundverb paradigm from this root is totally uncertain, because the context does not support a meaning 'drop'; see Krause, WTG, 122, § 120, fn. 6. Judging by the TA preterit formation, the intransitive grundverb had most likely A-character. For the etymology, note Melchert, 1978, 120, fn. 24.

pälw^ā- '(be)klagen', 'lament' (tr/itr) (a+/-/a)

       Prs V (a+) -,-, *palwaṃ*; *pälwāmo*,-,- Imp —

           nt-Part —

           m-Part *pälwāmane*

           Ger I *pälwālle* Abstr I —

       Sub V — Opt —

           Ger II — Abstr II *pälwālñe* Priv —

           Inf —

       Pt I (a) -,-, *plyāwa*;-,-, *plyawāre*

       PPt in *pepälyworsa*

       Ipv —

The 3.sg./pl. Prs is also attested in THT 1379 frg. a a 2. The Ger *pälwālle* in 284 a 6 is taken for a "Schreibfehler für [the abstract] *pälwālñe*" by Thomas, 1952, 59 for the reason that it is coordinated with other abstracts; on the other hand, gerundives can be substantivized, as Thomas, 1952 himself has shown; the expected Abstr is attested by the derived adjective *pälwālñeṣṣa* found in H 149.69 a 4; *pälwālle* in PK AS 12J a 5 (MQ) is most likely Ger I: *kañcuki weṣṣaṃ • palwālle te maṃt ñäke* (reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; the passage is also mentioned by Thomas, 1979b, 48, but without commentary or translation) "the chamberlain says: 'now one has to lament'". In the small fragment 147 frg. 4 a 1 one can read an Abs *pepälyworsa* (instead of *pepälyw orsa*, as read by TochSprR(B)), according to TEB I, 247, § 441,3. The verb is used transitively in 46 b 2: *nauṣ su plyāwa alyeṅkäṃ ceṃ ñake ce͜u wes pälwāmo* "früher beklagte der diese anderen, jetzt beklagen wir ihn" (TochSprR(B), transl., 69). All other forms from this root are used intransitively: 89 b 5 *k͜use nai tamp añmālaṣke palwaṃ säsweṃtse araṇemiñ lānte ṣpä ñem śauśäṃ* "Wer wohl klagt da so mitleiderregend [und] ruft den Namen des Herrn, des Königs Araṇemi?" (Schmidt, 2001, 319); 15 (= 17) a 1 *trik(au) l(ak)l(e)sa añc(ā)l ṣarne pälwām(ane po)yśiṃś rekauna* "(darauf sprach Ananda,) der von Leid verwirrte, mit zusammengelegten Händen, jammernd zu dem Allwissenden die Worte" (TochSprR(B), transl., 24). This is also true for the second attestation of the preterit: 45 a 3 *tu yparwe māka plyawāre ñakti śāmna* "[d]araufhin klagten sehr die Götter [und] die Menschen" (TochSprR(B), transl., 66). Evidently the root behaved precisely like Modern English *lament*, which can also used both transitively and intransitively. ᴇᴛʏᴍ. As per Schmidt, 1982, 365, the root is best derived from PIE *√mleu̯H 'speak' (H = h_2 or h_3 according to Hackstein, 1995, 18; H = h_2 according to ²LIV, 447, fn. 3: "Der Stamm *pluwā- muß wohl auf der 3p *mluh₂ánti beruhen, wodurch *h_2 für die Wurzel erwiesen wird"); as it seems,

Adams, DoT, 380 now rather sides with Schmidt than with his own former take on the root (Adams, 1988a, 67). Pace TEB I, 247, § 441,3, the PPt does not suggest a former status of the Pt as Pt II; there is no reason not to take the preterit for a Pt I of Subclass 7, i.e., as a Pt I of the *lyakāwa* type.

pälsk^a- 'bedenken, denken', 'consider, think' (tr) (x/x/x)

        Prs VI (x) -, *pälskanat, pälskanaṃ;* — | -,-, *pälskanātär* (MQ); —
             Imp *pälskanoym,-, pälsknoy* (sic); — | -,-, *pälskanoytär;* —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part *pälskanamane*
             Ger I *pälsknālle* (MQ) Abstr I —
        Sub V (x) *plāskau,-, plāskaṃ;* —
             Opt *pälskoym* (MQ),-, *pälskoy* (MQ); — | -,-, *palskoytär;* —
             Ger II — Abstr II *palskalyñe* Priv —
             Inf *palskatsi*
        Pt I (x) -,-, *palska;-,-, pälskāre* | -,-, *pälskāte;* —
        PPt *pälskau*
        Ipv I (a) *plāska* (MQ); *palskaso*

The 3.sg.mid. Imp *palskanoytar* is attested without clear context in THT 1235 b 4, and the non-MQ *m*-Part *pälskanamane* in THT 1681 a 1 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). The expected 1.sg. Sub *plāskau* is now attested in THT 1335 frg. 1 b 5. The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. *palskaso* in 621 b 4 is analyzed as imperative (instead of 2.pl. Pt) by Winter, 2001, 132 = 2005, 521 ad 381; and although the form is without context, the root accent (implying former **päpálskāso*) allows no other choice. The PPt is found in THT 1303 a 5 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.); pace Broomhead I, 179, instead of a pl. PPt of this root, one has to read *pälkoṣ* in H 149.49 (= IOL Toch 1) b 4; see Peyrot, 2007, s.v.

= ^A***päl(t)sk^a-*** 'denken', 'think' (tr) (x/-/x)

        Prs VII (x) *pältsäṅkām,-, pältsäṅkāṣ;-,-, pältsäṅkeñc* |
             -, *pältsäṅkātār,-;* —
             Imp -,-, *pältsäñśā;* —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part *pältsäṅkāmāṃ*
             Ger I — Abstr I —
             Inf *pältsäṅkātsi/pältsäṅkāsi*
        Sub V — Opt —
             Ger II *pältskāl* Abstr II *pälskālune*
        Pt I (x) *pälskā,-,-;* — | *pälske, pältskāte, pälskāt;-,-, pälskānt*
        PPt *pälsko*
        Ipv I (m) *ppälskār;-*

ETYM. Based on an **-sk̑e/o-* present from the same root that is continued by *pälk-* 'shine'; see Melchert, 1978, 104, followed by Adams, DoT, 381 and Hackstein, 1995, 37, who suggests a semantic development '(wiederholt) beleuchten' → 'bedenken'.

ᴬpäṣt- '± rufen, jauchzen, locken', '± call, cheer, woo' (itr) (a/-/-)

        Prs I (a) -,-, *päṣtṣ-äṃ*;-,-, *päṣtiñc* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

TG, 451 gives as translation "etwa 'locken'", TEB II, 117 'rufen, schreien (?)'. Since the 3.sg. Prs is attested without context, these proposals are undoubtedly based on the evidence of the 3.pl. Prs TA *päṣtiñc* in A 253 b 4, where it refers to some kind of joyful utterance or encouragement; on the passage see most recently Pinault, 2006c, 72f.: *(ypi)c pyāppyās waras ypanträ āñcālyī karyeñc ṣomaṃ päṣtiñc ṣomaṃ ṣi ats wasac pälkītār* "Elles font l'*añjali* (avec leurs mains) pleines de fleurs [et] de parfumes; certaines rient, certaines crient".

ᴬpäs- '± gießen, spritzen', '± spray, pour (water)' (tr) (a+/-/-)

        Prs I (a+) -,-, *päṣ/päṣṣ-äṃ*; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *päsmāṃ*
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

All attestations are without much context, but in each case the form seems to be constructed with the word for 'water': A 225 a 2 *wär päṣṣ-äm* "± pours water for them"; A 91 a 2 *wär päsmāṃ* "pouring water" (both readings according to TG, 451 contra TochSprR(A)). Consequently, TG, 451 restores the word for 'water' in the third attestation in A 374, 5: *////(wä)r päṣ kapśñac* "sprays (wat)er on the body". Note that TA *psäl* is not a Ger from this root, but is the equivalent of TB *pisäl* 'glume', as per Schmidt, 2002, 4f.

*päš*ᵃ- '± speak' → *pās*ᵃ- 'id.'

*ᴬpäš*ᵃ- '?' (?) (—)

        Prs VI — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *päsnāmāṃ*
                Ger I — Abstr I —

Inf —
Sub — Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

Unclear hapax in A 96 a 3: *talke ypamāṃ kosmāṃ päsnāmāṃ* "making a sacrifice, killing, ...ing".

pī̆[a]̄- '± blasen, trompeten', '± blow, trumpet' (tr/itr) (a/a/a)
        Prs V (a) —;-,-, *pīyaṃ* Imp —;-,-, *pyoyeṃ*/*piyoṃ*
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V (a) — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *pāyalyñe* Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I (a) -, *pāyāsta* (MQ),-; —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 3.pl. *pīyaṃ* in 589 a 6 is rather a present (thus, WTG, 261) than a subjunctive, because it is found together with the Prs form *kalneṃ*: *kalneṃ ploryaṃ tne pīyaṃ lwāsa ka – –* "the flutes resound, and the ... animals trumpet" (according to Pinault, 1994a, 188ff., *ploriyo* refers to a 'flute' or to some similar kind of 'wind instrument'; differently Schmidt, 1986, 127). *piyoṃ* is attested in 66 a 7 without context in sentence-final position (which makes it likely that this is a verbal form) after a damaged sign (not in WTG); that this form has not to be restored further and is hence a 3.pl. Imp from this root makes morphologically the most sense. Couvreur, 1954, 88 lists two additional attestations of this root from unpublished Paris texts: PK AS 15D b 2 *lo lmau tākoy mā keś wāyoy pāyalyñe* "dürfte er niedersitzen, nicht dürfte er das Blasen (?) beachten" and PK AS 15D a 7 *mek pyoyeṃ* "dürften eine Melodie (?) singen (?)", with *mek* probably being a loan from Skt. *megha-*. Adams, DoT, 467 adopts Couvreur's analysis of *mek*, but Georg, 2001, 494 objects to this etymology with the argument that Skt. *megha-* should have the meaning 'cloud'; however, pace Georg, *megha-* can indeed refer to one of the basic melodies (see, e.g., M-W, s.v. *rāga-*). In addition, Couvreur, l.c., analyzes the 2.sg. Pt *pāyāsta* in 214 b 4 as another form from this root (contra WTG, 219): *(spä)ntaiytsñeṣṣai wrākai pāyāsta klenauntsai* "die hallende Perlenmuschel des Vertrauens bliesest (?) du". ETYM. Sub V/Pt I are of the subtype with persistent root vowel -*ā*-. For the Prs V forms with root vowel *ă̄, see the discussion in chap. Prs V. The verb is usually connected with OCS *pěti* (WTG, 261); ²LIV, 465 sets up PIE *√peiH 'singen' on the evidence of the Toch. and OCS form; but see Reinhart in Eichner/Reinhart, 2006, 278f. As a matter of fact, the root rather denotes 'blow, trumpet' than 'sing'; for this reason, I

would like to equate it with *ᴬpiwᵃ-* 'blow', see below s.v., and also s.v. *pi(-n)-* and *ᴬpis-*.

pikᵃ- 'malen, schreiben', 'bilden', 'paint, write', 'form' (tr) (a+/m/x)

        Prs VII (a+) -,-, *piṅkäṃ;-,-, piṅkäṃ* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *piṅkemane*
                Ger I *piṅkalle* Abstr I —
        Sub V (m) -,-, *paiykatär-ne;* — Opt —
                Ger II *paikalle* Abstr II *paikalñe* Priv —
                Inf *paikatsi*
        Pt I (x) -,-, *paiyka; paiykäm,-, paiykāre | paikāmai,-, paikāte;* —
        PPt *papaikau | papaikāṣ*
        Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs is often attested in caravan travel passports (see the index in Pinault, 1987, 192f.). A Ger II *paikalle* is only listed in TochSprR(B), glossary, 140; TEB I, 205, § 371,1 furthermore lists a 3.pl. Prs *piṅkeṃ* which is a ghost form, according to Schmidt, 1994a, 224; on the other hand, Schmidt, 1987a, 293 analyzes *piṅkäṃ* in BM a [= b] 6 as 3.pl. instead of 3.sg. (on the text, see also Malzahn, 2007a, 273). The subjunctive stem has persistent initial accent. The 3.pl. Pt *paiykāre* is attested in the graffito G-Qm 5, a (misspelled) variant *paiykere* in G-Qm 12, and the 1.pl. Pt *paiykām* in the graffito G-Su 32 (see Pinault, 1987, s.v. and ad "Errata"), and also in SHT 1, 768: *indr(a)s(·)nts[e] p[e]lkeṃ paikām ceṃ pkarsas* "Wisset, [dass] wir diese Udānas für Indr(a)s(·) geschrieben haben"; see Schmidt, 1974, 450f. (contra SHT). The PPt *papaikāṣ* is found in PK AS 12D b 6 (MQ) (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

= *ᴬpikᵃ-* 'malen, schreiben', 'paint, write' (tr) (x/m/x)

        Prs I (x) -,-, *pikäṣ;-,-, pikiñc | -,-, piktär;-,-, pikäntär* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *piktsi*
        Sub V (m) -,-, *pekatär;* — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *peklune*
        Pt I (x) — ;-,-, *pekar | peke,-, pekat; pekamät,-,-*
        PPt *pāpeku*
        Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. *piṅkäṃ* in BM a [= b] 6 has the meaning 'form', according to Schmidt, 1987a, 293: "Sie formen die Gestalt[en] der Wesen". Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived either from PIE *√peig̑ 'malen' (²LIV, 464) or *√peik̑ (²LIV, 465f.: original meaning 'heraushauen, herausschneiden' → 'malen' already in PIE); see Adams, DoT, 384. On TA *pik-* see chap. Prs I 24.2.; on TA *pekant* 'painter' attesting to a former present stem of its morphological structure, see chap. Prs Part.

pi(-n)- '?' (?) (−)
      Prs Xa − Imp −
           nt-Part −
           m-Part −
           Ger I *pinaṣle* Abstr I −
      Sub − Opt −
           Ger I − Abstr II − Priv −
           Inf −
      Pt −
      PPt −
      Ipv −

The form is a hapax in Fill. Y 2 a 4: *meleṃne pinaṣle*. Sieg, 1938, 49, fn. 3 proposed a meaning 'schmieren', and was in this respect followed by Couvreur, 1954, 84, but later the same scholar (Sieg, 1955, 66) translated "[die Medizin] ist in die Nase zu blasen", this time followed by Carling, 2003a, 52. Accordingly, one cannot be sure that this root belongs with *pi^a-* '± blow, trumpet', as is usually claimed.

pilts- 'anspannen' → *päl-* 'listen closely'

*^{A}**piw$^?$-*** 'card' → *^{A}pew$^{a?}$-* 'id.'

*^{A}**piw^a-*** '(an)blasen', 'blow' (tr) (a/-/-)
      Prs V (a) -,-, *piwāṣ-äṃ/piwāṣ*; − Imp −
           nt-Part −
           m-Part −
           Ger I − Abstr I −
           Inf −
      Sub − Opt −
           Ger II − Abstr II −
      Pt I in
      PPt *pāpeyu*
      Ipv −

Two of the three forms are attested in A 124, a text that deals with the digestion system (cf. Schmidt, 1974, 266), and both of these two refer to TA *want* 'wind'. Schmidt translates A 124 b 5: "wenn sie [scil. die Speise] sich im Āmāśaya (~ Magen) befindet, von Wasser [und] Wind angefeuchtet [und] angeblasen ..."; similarly, Adams, 1982, 134: "the water wets it, the wind blows it". The 3.sg. Prs is now also attested in YQ 32 a 6: *piwāṣṣ oky akṣa(räs) ////*. The text in line a 6f. deals with the (bad) teachings of the brahmin Bādhari: *(päñ kän)t m(a)narkāśśi sne eṃts sne ṣṭare pkis āklāṣ śāsträntu • piwāṣṣ oky akṣa(räs) //// (knānmā?)ñcäs yaṣ m=ālyes knānmāñcäs yaṣ kārūṇik wrasom*. Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 33 do not propose a translation of TA *piwāṣ* in this particular passage: "to all (five hundred) novices he teaches the Śāstras without attachment, without effort. ... as it were (the) syllables (?) ... he makes ... (knowledgeable?), he does not make ... knowledgeable, the compassionate

being". In my opinion, one could think of a translation "as if he would just blow syllables", which may be a metaphor for "talking nonsense". Eтym. The TA verb can be equated with TB *pi^ā*- '± blow, trumpet' in case one is willing to trace the preterits made from these roots back to a PT proto-form *pæ/āyw'ā- < *pæ/āw'yā- < pre-PT *pŏu̯(i)i̯ā/ō- (cf. TB *śaiyye*, TA *śāyu* 'sheep/goat' < pre-PT *g^u̯i̯ōu̯(i)i̯o-), which may further be equated with Arm. *(h)ogi* 'breath, soul, spirit', "vielleicht < *pou̯i̯o- zu einer schallnachahmenden Wurzel *pu* 'pusten, blasen'" (as per Klingenschmitt, 1982, 166, fn. 11). See also s.v. *^Apis-*.

^Apis- '(Instrument) spielen, blasen', 'play (a musical instrument), blow' (tr) (—)
                Prs — Imp —
                        nt-Part —
                        m-Part —
                        Ger I — Abstr I —
                        Inf —
                Sub IX — Opt —
                        Ger II *pisāṣlaṃ* Abstr II —
                Pt —
                PPt —
                Ipv —

The form is a hapax in A 301 b 3: *rapeyäntu pisāṣlaṃ koṣtlaṃ* "musical instruments are to be played/blown and to strike". Cf. Adams, DoT, 383. The one attested form looks like a form from a kausativum that was based upon another kausativum made from *^Apiw^ā*- 'blow' (TA *pis-* possibly deriving from pre-TA *päyys- < *päyws- < *päywäs-; see below s.v. *miw^(a)-*), but the semantics is still 'blow'.

^Apuk- 'ripen' → *^Apäk-* 'cook, ripen'

putk- 'schließen', 'shut' (tr) (-/a/-)
                Prs — Imp —
                        nt-Part —
                        m-Part —
                        Ger I — Abstr I —
                Sub I (a) —; *pūtkäm* (MQ),-,- Opt —
                        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                        Inf —
                Pt III in
                PPt *putkuweṣ*
                Ipv —

The meaning of this root is certainly 'shut (a door)'; see Thomas, 1979b, 45; Pinault, 1994, 119f. with fn. 18; Pinault, 2000a, 151, and Schmidt, 1999a, 104ff. with ref. to Couvreur, 1953, 282 for PK AS 12H b 6. In older publications such as Thomas, l.c., the reading is given as *mūtkäm* in PK AS 12H b 6, resp. *mutkuweṣ* in PK AS 17J b 1, but Schmidt, 1999a, 104ff. points out that one has to read *pūtkäm* and *putkuweṣ*, respectively. As for the analysis of *pūtkäm*, the

context makes it highly likely that the form is a subjunctive (thus Pinault and Schmidt). Since PK AS 12H has MQ character, it is unclear whether the subjunctive has initial accent or not. It is most likely a back-formation to the Pt III presupposed by the PPt. Etymologically, the root may have the same origin as *putk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'divide'.

putk⁽ᵃ⁾- '(ver)teilen, trennen, unterscheiden', 'divide, separate, distinguish'
  (tr) (x/a/x)
  Prs VII (x) -,-, *puttaṅgaṃ* (sic);-,-, *puttaṅkeṃ* | -,-, *puttaṅktär;*—
      Imp —
      nt-Part —
      m-Part —
      Ger I *puttaṅkälle* Abstr I —
  Sub V (a) *pautkau,-,-;-,-, putkaṃ* Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II *putkalñe* Priv —
      Inf *putkatsi*
  Pt I (x) —;-,-, *putkār* (sic) | -,-, *putkāte;-, putkat* (sic),-
  PPt *putkowä* (Š) | *putkoṣ*
  Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *puttaṅgaṃ* translates Skt. *vibhajati* 'distinguishes' in the bilingual text PK NS 13 + 516 a 5 (Couvreur, 1967, 154). The 3.pl. Sub *putkaṃ* is attested in IOL Toch 568 frg. a a 2 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.), and the Inf *putkatsi* in the same text in line a 1, and also in IOL Toch 793 a 3 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.) and in H add.149 71 a 4 (Broomhead I, 329). The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. The 3.pl. Pt *putkār* (Ipv is excluded) is found in the business document SI P/117, 2: *śwāra pwārane śaumoṣe pauśye lau putkār⟍* "they have posted the men being in service separately to the four fires" (cf. Pinault, 1998, 15; Schmidt, 2001c, 161 suggests the same reading but a highly unlikely different translation and interpretation of the passage); the 3.sg.mid. Pt *putkāte* is attested in PK Cp 36, 34 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 2.pl.mid. Pt *putkat* in PK NS 164 b 3 (cf. Bernhard, 1958, 209).

Kausativum III 'teilen', 'divide' (tr) (m/-/-)
  Prs IXb (m) —;-,-, *putkäskentär* Imp —
      nt-Part —
      m-Part —
      Ger I *putkäṣṣälya* Abstr I —
  Sub — Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
      Inf —
  Pt —
  PPt —
  Ipv —

putkäskentär is only listed in TEB II, 211 without ref. The PPt *pepputku* listed in WTG, 262 with the ref. M 153.2 b 4 (now = SHT 7, 1704) has to be read *pepyutkuwa* (→ *pyutk-* 'come into being'), according to K. T. Schmidt (apud SHT 7, 1704).

= ^{A}***putk^a-*** 'teilen, trennen, unterscheiden', 'divide, separate, distinguish'

> (tr) (x/a/a)
>
> Prs VII (x) -,-, *putäṅkäṣ;* — | —;-,-, *pūtäṅkäntär* Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
>> Inf *pūtäṅkätsi*
>
> Sub V (a) *potkam,-,-;* — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II *putkälune*
>
> Pt I (a) -,-, *putäk;-,-, potkar*
>
> PPt *putko*
>
> Ipv —

A 3.sg. Pt TA *pu(täk)* is arguably attested in YQ 3 b 1 and a 3.pl. Pt TA *(po)tkar* in YQ 9 a 3; see also Pinault, 1990, 154. Maybe one can restore a 3.sg.mid. Prs TA *(p)[u]ṭaṅkātṛa yoṣm(o)ṩ* in the small fragment THT 1411 frg. f a 1.

SEM. The basic meaning is 'divide' judging by the nominal forms *pautke* 'tribute, share' and TA *potäk* 'paw', according to Winter, 1982a, 401. All middle forms are passives. ETYM. Since long connected with Lat. *putāre* 'prune', and deriving the root from a pre-PT *put-ske/o- (see Adams, DoT, 391 with ref.) would, of course, imply that the Latin verb to be compared had not started out as denominative to Lat. *putus* 'pure' often said to contain itself a root allomorph *puH- or *pHu- otherwise met in Lat. *pūrus* 'pure' (as recently claimed again by de Vaan, 2008, 502); see against such an assumption esp. Melchert, 1978, 123.

perk$^?$- 'lugen, spähen', 'peer' (itr) (m/-/-)

> Prs II (m) —;-,-, *perkentär-me* Imp —;-,-, *perśīyeṃtär*
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
>
> Sub — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
>> Inf —
>
> Pt —
>
> PPt —
>
> Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs *perkentär-me* is attested in PK AS 17I + NS 77.1 b 5 and PK AS 17J b 1, the 3.pl. Imp *perśīyeṃtär* in PK AS 17J a 5; see Pinault, 1994, 114ff. Since the Imp shows a palatalized root final, it is more likely that we have to do with a Prs II than with a Prs III. ETYM. Pinault, 1994, 121ff. after discussing PIE *√(s)perĝ^h 'se mouvoir rapidement, se hâter' and PIE *√b^{h}erh₁ĝ/k̂ 'luire, briller' as possible etyma, finally seems to opt for *√b^{h}erg^h 'garder, tenir en sûreté' and was followed by Zimmer, 1996, 119 (*√b^{h}erg^h 'beachten, bewahren', ^{2}LIV, 79f., without Toch.). Adams, DoT, 396 proposes an onomatopoetic origin.

Apewᵃ?- '(Wolle) kämmen', 'card (wool)' (itr) (-/-/m)

       Prs — Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

            Inf —

       Sub — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II —

       Pt I (m) -,-, *pewat;* —

       PPt —

       Ipv —

Certain hapax in YQ 21 b 3: *mäccāk pewat* "she herself did the carding"; see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 144f. It is unclear whether the root had A-character or not, but A-character is far more likely. ETYM. According to Pinault, 2001, 133, to be derived from PIE *√bʰei̯H 'split'.

Apotᵃ- 'honor, flatter' → *pautᵃ-* 'id.'

pautᵃ- 'schmeicheln', 'honor, flatter' (itr) (m/a/-)

       Prs IV (m) -,-, *pautotär;*-,-, *pautontär* Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I *pautolle* Abstr I —

       Sub V (a) — Opt -,-, *pautoy;* —

            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

            Inf —

       Pt I in

       PPt *papautaṣ*

       Ipv —

Beside *papautarmeṃ*, the PPt *papauta(ṣ)* is now attested in IOL Toch 477 a 2 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.).

= *Apotᵃ-* 'schmeicheln', 'honor, flatter' (itr) (m/-/-)

       Prs IV (m) -,-, *potatär;* — Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

            Inf —

       Sub V — Opt —

            Ger II *potal* Abstr II *potlune*

       Pt —

       PPt —

       Ipv —

SEM. The verb is intransitive and construed with the allative (see Kölver, 1965, 88; for 33 b 3, see also ²TochSprR(B), 203). ETYM. PIE *√bʰeu̯dʰ 'wach werden, aufmerksam werden' (²LIV, 82f.). This connection goes back to Lane, 1938, 27, who, nevertheless, later (1948, 310) rather supported a by now entirely

outdated etymology by Pedersen, 1943, 18f. Evidently this is a denominative
to an abstract *bʰoud̯ʰo- 'listening, attention', cf. the semantics of Greek
πυνθάνομαι ('learn, hear') and especially the Greek personal names with
Πυθ(ο)- as first member as interpreted by Dubois, 2006, 55ff.

pyāk- '(ein-, nieder-)schlagen', 'strike, beat' (tr) (-/a/a)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub I (a) — Opt *pyāśim-me,-, pyāśi-ne;-,-, pyāśyeṃ* (MQ)
                Ger II *pyākäle* Abstr II *pyākälyñe* (MQ) Priv —
                Inf *pyāktsi*
        Pt III (a) —;-,-, *pyakar*
        PPt *papyāku* | *papyākoṣ*
        Ipv —

A Ger II *pyākäle* is a gloss in a Paris Sanskrit text, according to Couvreur,
1970, 182, and since the singular Opt forms are found in non-MQ texts (for H
149.298, see Broomhead I, 129f.; for H 149 add.8, see Broomhead I, 96f., and
Schmidt, 1974, 361), we are dealing with a subjunctive with persistent initial
accent. A middle *pyāśitar̦* is probably furthermore attested in THT 4060 a 3
(without context; cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). The 3.pl. Pt *pyakar* is found in PK NS
410 a 2: *eneṅka pyakar* "sie schlugen ein", according to K. T. Schmidt apud
Hackstein, 1993, 142f. with fn. 13.

= ᴬ*pyāk-* '(ein-, nieder-)schlagen', 'strike, beat' (tr) (—)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *pyākässi*
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The Inf TA *(py)ākässi* is restored in A 311 b 6 by Thomas, 1956, 152; see also
Hackstein, 1993, 144, with fn. 22.
Sᴇᴍ. For the semantics, see Hackstein, 1993, 143ff. in detail; the phrase *āś*
pyāk- lit. 'beat on the head' has the figurative meaning 'depress, distress'.
Eᴛʏᴍ. PIE *√pi̯eh₂ 'schlagen' (²LIV, 481f.), according to Hackstein, 1993, 141ff.,
who claims that *pyāk-* derives from an aorist stem *pih₂-k-.

ᴬ*pyāṣt⁽ä⁾-* 'kräftig sein, genährt werden', 'be strong, be nourished' (itr) (m/-/-)

        Prs IV (m) -,-, *pyaṣtatär;* — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

            Inf —

      Sub V — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II *pyāṣtlune*

    Pt —

    PPt —

    Ipv —

KAUSATIVUM I 'wachsen lassen, aufziehen', 'make grow' (tr) (a/-/x)

      Prs VIII (a) -,-, *pyāṣtäṣ;*— Imp —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part —

          Ger I *pyāṣtäṣlis* (sic) Abstr I —

          Inf —

      Sub — Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II —

      Pt IV (x) -,-, *pyāṣtṣā-m;*— | *pyāṣtṣe,-, pyāṣtṣāt;-,-, pyāṣtṣānt*

      PPt —

      Ipv —

I think that one can read TA *pyāṣtṣā<m> malkeyo* "she made (them) grow with milk" in YQ 21 b 3, i.e., a correct form with following enclitic pronoun TA -*m* (consonant simplification in sandhi is not unusual).

SEM. TG, 452 does not give a translation for the root; Couvreur, 1967, 158 translates 'sterken, wel bekomen'. Prs TA *pyāṣtäṣ* in A 460 b 2 translates Skt. *cchādayati* 'enjoy, like' (= Pāli *cādeti*). The passage is the equivalent of DN I, 72 *bhattañ ca me na cchādesi* "food does not do me good" (see Couvreur, 1967, 156). Five (transitive) attestations of this root in the YQ manuscript confirm a meaning 'nourish, make grow'; see Pinault, 2001, 132, and cf. also TA *pyāṣtlune* in A 359, 40, which translates Skt. *br̥ṃhaṇa-* 'nourishment'. In A 104 a 1 one has to read TA *pyaṣtatär*, which has to be translated "life is strong/well nourished", according to TochSprR(A), 252 ad p. 59 with ref. to A 331 a 1: *(ra)sāyaṃyo pyaṣtatr āriñc* "the heart is strong/is nourished by the elixir of life" (reading and restoration according to Couvreur, 1956, 76). ETYM. Maybe ultimately to be derived from PIE *√peiH 'anschwellen' (²LIV, 464, without Toch.), according to Levet, 1975, 106, who already wanted to derive *pyā-* from *piH- and also pointed to the parallel formation of ᴬ*koṣtä-* 'hit' (see s.v.); according to the communis opinio on laryngeal developments, we would in this case deal with *h₂ or *h₃, i.e., *pih₂/₃-sT- > *p(i)i̯ā-st- > TA *pyāṣt-*. Hackstein, 2002a, 275, fn. 35 now derives the root from a *to*-adjective *pih₂/₃t-to-; alternatively, one could set up *peiH(ō)s-te-h₂, the abstract of a denominative *to*-adjective.

pyutk- act. 'zustande kommen', 'come into being', mid. 'hervorrufen, zustandebringen', 'establish, create, accomplish' (itr/tr) (x/a/x)

      Prs IXb (x) -,-, *pyutkäṣṣäṃ;-,-, pyutkäske-ne* | -,-, *pyutkästär;*— Imp —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part —

                    Ger I — Abstr I —
          Sub IXb (a) — Opt *pyutkäṣṣim*,-,-; —
                    Ger II — Abstr II *pyutkäṣñe* (sic) Priv —
                    Inf *pyutkässi*
          Pt II (x) -,-, *pyautka*;-,-, *pyautkare| pyautkamai*,-,-;—
          PPt *pepyutkuwa| pepyutkoṣ*
          Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. *pyutkastar*\ attested in THT 1371 frg. g a 5 is without context. A
1.sg. Opt (or Imp?) *pyutkäṣṣim* is found in the small fragment THT 1335 frg. a
a 2: //// *pyutkaṣṣim waste nestsi* //// "I would become (became?) a refuge".
The 1.sg.mid. Pt *pyautkamai* is attested in the letter PK LC XVI (unpublished,
reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), a nom.pl. PPt *pepyutkuwa* in SHT 7,
1704 (see also Schmidt, 1990, 476f.; 1994b, 270f.; 2000, 233f.); PPt *pepyu(tkoṣ)*,
respectively *pepyutko(ṣ)*, has to be restored in 268 b 3 and 380 b 6, according
to TochSprR(B), s.v.

= ^A***pyutk-*** act. 'zustande kommen', 'come into being', mid. 'hervorrufen,
          zustandebringen', 'establish, create, accomplish' (itr/tr) (a/x/x)
          Prs VIII (a) -,-, *pyutkäṣ*;— Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
                    Inf —
          Sub IX (x) —;-,-, *pyutkāseñc| pyutkāsmār*,-, *pyutkäṣtär*;— Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II —
          Pt II (x) -,-, *papyutäk*;— |-,-, *papyutkāt*;-,-, *papyutkāṃt*
          Pt III (a) -,-, *pyockäs/pyocksā-ci*;—
          PPt *papyätku*
          Ipv —

TA *papyutäk* is attested in B 605 a 4 in a TA colophon to an akṣara chart
(published in TochSprR(B), because there is a TB text on the verso side).
SEM. The root has a remarkable voice/valency behavior; see chap. Voice
5.2.2.1. In TA, the active is intransitive 'come into being', the middle is
transitive 'establish, create, accomplish'; there is no difference in meaning
between the TA Pt II and the TA Pt III. In TB, there are only two middle forms
and both are without clear context, so it is not entirely certain, but
nevertheless likely, that TB had the same voice/valency alternation as TA.
Since *pyautkamai* in the letter PK LC XVI is a 1. person, a translation 'I have
created/accomplished' makes much more sense than 'I have come into being'.
ETYM. The traditional etymology is PIE *√bʰuH 'become' (²LIV, 98ff. without
Toch.); see, e.g., Melchert, 1978, 121 ("unavoidable"); Van Windekens (VW I,
399) objects that this etymology leaves the palatal root initial unexplained,
and he is followed by Adams, DoT, 409, who prefers to derive the verb from a
compound *pä-yutk-; to be sure, it has been claimed that *py-* had spread from
the Pt II in TB and eventually was borrowed into TA; see Lane, 1965, 96 and
Melchert, 1978, 121. Alternatively, one may toy with the idea that pre-PT *ū

turned into Early PT *yū after both a labial and pre-PT *l, on account of *pyutk-* and TA *lyom* 'mud, mire', respectively.

TA **prak-** → *ᴬpärk-* 'ask (for)'

TA **pras-** → *ᴬpärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sprinkle'

TA **prask-** → *ᴬpärsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be afraid'

prāk²- '± fest machen', '± fix' (?) (—)
      Prs — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf —
      Pt III in
      PPt *paprāku*
      Ipv —
According to Schmidt, 2000, 231, one can read *paprāku* in 71, 4 (TochSprR(B) restored *pa(py)aku*) from a root *prāk-* with unknown meaning (not in Saito, 2006). D. Q. Adams (p.c.) suggests a connection with the adj. *prākre* 'firm, fixed' and proposes the translation: "from above the top-knot crown [is/was] firmly fixed". Note that pace Broomhead I, 249 there is no second attestation of this form in H add.149 88 a 4 ("*(pa)[p]rākoṣ*"), because here one has to read *[t](e)[t]r[ī]koṣ* instead (see Peyrot, 2007, s.v.).

prām²- '± im Zaum halten', '± restrain' (tr) (—)
      Prs — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub IXb — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf *prāmässi* (Š)
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —
Hapax in 18 a 3: *palsko kantwa prāmässi-ś* "um Geist und Zunge im Schranken zu halten"; see TochSprR(B), transl., 28 (ad 16/18 b 6).

prāsk- → *pärsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be afraid'

pränk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich fern-, zurückhalten', 'restrain oneself, keep away' (itr) (m/-/-)

        Prs III (m) -,-, *pränketär;—* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *pränkātsi* (MQ)
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

A 3.pl. Prs is probably attested in THT 1126 b 3: *mā cai prạṅke<ṃ>trạ* 1 •
"they do not restrain themselves".

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'zurück-, abweisen', 'reject' (tr) (a/a/a)

        Prs IXb (a) -,-, *praṅkäṣṣäṃ;—* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub IXb (a) -, *praṅkäs-me* (S, sic),-;— Opt *praṅkäṣṣim*,-,-;—
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt II (a) -, *prāṅkasta*,-;—
        PPt *pepraṅku | pepraṅkoṣ*
        Ipv —

The 2.sg. *praṅkäs-me* (informal variant of †*praṅkäst-me*) in 107 b 1 is Sub
(Thomas, ²TochSprR(B), 256; Pinault, 2008, 143). The 2.sg. Pt *prāṅkasta* is
found in PK AS 17C b 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.,
also listed in TEB II, 215 without ref.), the PPt *pepraṅkoṣ* in the small
fragment IOL Toch 915 b 3 (cf. Tamai, 2007, s.v.); it is uncertain whether
(pep)räṅkoṣ is the correct restoration in 529 b 2 (D); a likewise initially
damaged *(pe)prạṅkoṣa(ṃts\?)* seems attested in THT 1468 a 4. Both forms
may also belong to the grundverb.

= ᴬ*pränk²-* 'sich zurückhalten', 'restrain oneself' (itr) (a/-/-)

        Prs I (a) —;-,-, *pränkiñc/pränki-ñi* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

TA *(p)rä(ṅ)k(i)ñc* is restored in A 64 b 1 by Sieg, Übers. II, 24, fn. 17 (contra
TochSprR(A)).

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'zurück-, abweisen', 'reject' (tr) (a/-/a)

      Prs VIII (a) -, *pränkäṣt,*-; — Imp -,-, *pränkṣā;* —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part —

          Ger I — Abstr I —

          Inf *pränkässi*

      Sub — Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II —

      Pt II (a) -, *papränkāṣt,*-; —

      PPt in *papränkuräṣ*

      Ipv —

A transitive Inf TA *(prän)[kä]ss(i)* can be restored in YQ 10 a 7, cf. Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 124 (the reading *(prän)[kä]ts(i)* in the edition has to be a typo, cf. Schmidt, 1999b, 281). The unpublished fragment where the 2.sg. Pt TA *papränkāṣt* (TG, 453) is attested can be identified as THT 1308 frg. 2 a 4.

ᴬ***pris-*** '± besprengen', '± sprinkle' (?) (a/-/-)

      Prs VII/VIII (a) —;-,-, *prisseñc* Imp —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part —

          Ger I — Abstr I —

          Inf —

      Sub — Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II —

      Pt —

      PPt —

      Ipv —

TA *prisseñc* is a hapax in A 276 b 6; the text concerns act XVI of MSN, and the passage in question deals with good deeds that will lead to the encounter with the future Buddha Maitreya: //// *ñc mośyo yp(e)ñc prisseñc pikiñc yärsanträ* //// "(if) they ..., make with *moś, prisseñc,* paint, purge ritually". Sieg/Müller, 1916, 402 already edited this text in a synoptic view together with the Old Turkish parallel version (now = MaitrSäŋim (XVI) 51 a 1ff.; see Tekin, 1980, 142), but TA *prisseñc* was left untranslated in this 1916 edition and also in TG, 453. The same passage is now also attested in the Old Turkish Hami version (= MaitrHami XVI, 14 b 12ff.; identification according to Pinault, 1999, 202), which is almost entirely an equivalent of the Sängim version. Since TA *pikiñc* 'paint' and TA *yärsanträ* 'purge ritually' are the equivalents of Old Turkish *bädizäsär* 'if one paints' and *suvka kigürsär* 'if one dips into water', the preceding forms, i.e., TA *mośyo yp(e)ñc prisseñc* must be the equivalents of Old Turkish *suvasar* and *[y]ürüŋ toprak tokısar* "if one stamps white earth/clay". TA *mośyo ypeñc* is the equivalent of Old Turkish *[y]ürüŋ toprak tokısar,* cf. Pinault, 1994c, 366, who translates TA *mośyo* with "avec du torchis, de l'enduit". Old Turkish *toprak* is, according to J. P. Laut (p.c.) "sicherlich ein Baumaterial für Häuser", and the building of monasteries was certainly one possibility to achieve merits. As a parallel, J. P. Laut refers me to MaitrSäŋim

(?) 101 b 16f., being an equivalent of the passage with the second attestation of TA *moś* in A 148 b 5: *wyār mośyo yāmlune* //// "building of a monastery with *moś*". Hence, we are finally left with Old Turkish *suvasar* as equivalent of TA *prisseñc*. Old Turkish *suvasar* is translated with "glättet" in Müller/Sieg, 1916, 402; Tekin, 1980, 142, and Geng/Klimkeit, 1985, 90. However, this meaning is rather unlikely, according to the following information kindly provided by J. P. Laut: "Bei *suva-* 'bewässern, nässen, besprengen' handelt es sich um ein denominales Verb (< *suv* 'Wasser'); ob hiermit letztlich ein 'Glätten' gemeint ist, bleibt unklar"; J. P. Laut also referred me to Zieme, 1974, 300f., who discusses 'bewässern' as a probable meaning for this verb. J. P. Laut (p.c.) further proposes to translate the form in question in MaitrSäŋim (XVI) 51 a 1 precisely rather with "und (rituell?) besprengt". A similar meaning for the TA equivalent *prisseñc* can also be supported by etymological considerations. Already TG, 453 compared TA *prisseñc* (with question mark) with ᴬ*pärs⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sprinkle, spray'. As a matter of fact, a form †*priseñc* would be the exact equivalent of a 3.pl.act. form of the TB Prs VII from *pärsᵃ-* act. 'sprinkle (tr)', mid. 'spray (itr)', which is attested by a 3.sg.act. *prantsäṃ* and a 3.sg.mid. Imp *präntsitär*, see s.v.

pruk⁽ᵃ⁾- '(weg)springen', 'jump, leap (away)' (itr) (x/-/a)

        Prs VI (x) -,-, *pruknaṃ;—* | -,-, *pruknātär;-,-, pruknāntär*

            Imp —;-,-, *pruknoyeṃ*

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

            Inf —

        Pt I (a) -,-, *pruka;—*

        PPt —

        Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *pruknaṃ* is attested in PK AS 7M a 6, the 3.pl. Imp *pruknoyeṃ* in PK AS 15B b 4 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

Aɴᴛɪɢʀᴜɴᴅᴠᴇʀʙ 'übergehen, ignorieren', 'overlook, neglect, ignore' (tr) (m/-/a)

        Prs VIII (m) -, *prukṣtar, prukṣtär;-,-, prukseṃtär* Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part *pruksemane*

            Ger I — Abstr I *prukṣälñe* (MQ)

        Sub — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

            Inf —

        Pt VII (a) -,-, *pruśiya/pruśya;—*

        PPt *peprukweṣ*

        Ipv —

The 2.sg. Prs *prukṣtar* is attested in PK AS 17C b 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 3.pl. Prs *prukseṃtär* in PK AS 17I + NS

77.1 b 5 (Pinault, 1994, 115). Broomhead II, 188 restores an Abstr I *prukṣa[l](ñ)[e]* in 523 b 3 (differently WTG, 263: Ger I *prukṣa[l](y)[e]*), and the Abstr I *prukṣalñ(e)* is now attested beyond doubt in THT 1230 frg. g b 1 (apparently MQ character). The Pt VII is transitive and belongs to the antigrundverb: 42 a 5 *ñiś tremeṃñ pruśiya* "he ignored me out of anger" (see TochSprR(B), transl., 62); it does not have 'durative' meaning (see Winter, 1961, 89ff. = 1984, 160 = 2005, 28ff.); the second attestation of the Pt VII is without context. The PPt *peprukweṣa* (listed as *pepruku* in TEB II, 215 without ref.) is found in THT 1536 frg. c + e b 2 (MQ) (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.).
ETYM. PIE *√(s)preu̯g 'jump'; see Hackstein, 1995, 36; Adams, DoT, 417 with ref. (not in ²LIV); and note in addition Melchert, 1978, 115 ("to be derived ultimately from IE *preu- 'jump'").

prutk⁽ā⁾- 'versperrt, ausgeschlossen sein', 'erfüllt sein', 'be shut', 'be filled'

> (itr) (m/m/a)
> Prs III (m) -,-, *prutketär*;-,-, *prutkentär* Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part *prutkemane*
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
> Sub V (m) -,-, *prutkātär*;-,-, *prutkāntär* Opt -,-, *prutkoytär*; —
>> Ger II — Abstr II *prutkālñe* Priv —
>> Inf —
> Pt I + III (a) —;-,-, *prutkāre/prautkar*
> PPt *prutkauwa*
> Ipv —

A standard-TB 3.sg. Sub *prutkātär* is now attested in THT 2237 a 3 (S): *kantwo prutkātar*. The 3.pl. Pt *prut[k]āre* is found in PK AS 18B a 1 (Pinault, 1984, 376; 2008, 80). For Pt *prautkar* attested in 108 b 6 (S), see chap. Pt I 7.2.1.1.
KAUSATIVUM I 'versperren', 'füllen', 'shut', 'fill up' (tr) (a/a/a)

> Prs IXb (a) *prutkaskau* (Š, sic),-, *prutkäṣṣäṃ/ prutkaṣṣäṃ* (sic);
>> -,-, *prutkäskem* (MQ) Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part *prutkäskemane*
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
> Sub IXb (a) — Opt -,-, *prutkaṣṣi* (MQ); —
>> Ger II *prutkäṣṣälle* Abstr II — Priv —
>> Inf *prutkästsi* (MQ)
> Pt II (a) -,-, *prautka*; —
> PPt *peprutku | peprutkoṣ*
> Ipv I (m) *prutkar*;–

The *m*-Part *prutkäskemane* is attested in PK NS 31 a 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 3.sg. (most likely Opt) *prutkaṣṣi* in THT 1314 a 5, and the PPt *peprutkoṣ* in 520 a 3. On the suffix variant *-ask-/-aṣṣ-*, see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.4.2. For the transitive Ipv I *prutkar*, see chap. Valency 4.10.1.

= ^A**prutk^(ä)-** 'versperrt sein', 'erfüllt sein', 'be shut', 'be filled' (itr) (-/a/a)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub V (a) -,-, *protkaṣ*;— Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *prutkālune*
        Pt I (a) -,-, *prutäk*;-,-, *protkar*
        PPt *prutko*
        Ipv —

The 3.sg. Pt TA *prutäk* is attested in YQ 33 b 5.

Kausativum I 'versperren', 'füllen', 'shut', 'fill up' (tr) (a/a/a)

                Prs VIII (a) -,-, *prutkäṣ*;-,-, *prutäkseñc* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub IX (a) -,-, *prutkāṣ*;-,-, *prutkāseñc* Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II (a) —;-,-, *paprutkār*
        PPt *paprutku*
        Ipv —

TA *p[r](u)tkāse(ñc)* in A 165 a 3 (restored by TG, 453 with question mark) may be without context, but since the upper part of the document above the akṣara *p[r](·)* is clearly preserved, and only the lower part damaged, we must be dealing with either *pr(a)* or *pr(ŭ)*.

Sem. The verb often translates Skt. *ni* √rudh, which basically has the meaning 'stop, check' (cf. also Skt. *nirodha-* 'destruction' = *prutkālñe*), but its PPP *niruddha-* can have the special meaning 'filled (with), veiled'. We are either dealing with a calque from Sanskrit that has spread from the participle into other parts of the paradigm, or with an independent semantic development of a similar kind in Tocharian. In A 356 b 4 the verb has rather the meaning 'were shut' than 'were filled', as per Kölver, 1965, 21 and Melchert, 1978, 119, because according to Indian medical doctrine, mental disease causes blocking of corporal vessels and, as a consequence, fainting: *cam klopyo āṣānikyāp bodhisatvāp puk (ma)rmañ protkar-äṃ – – tkanā klā* "[b]y that suffering all the veins of the venerable *Bodhisattva* were blocked ... he fell to the ground" (Melchert, l.c.). Etym. The etymology is unclear; see the discussion in Adams, DoT, 417f. (who prefers a compound *pä-rutk-), and Melchert, 1978, 121, who compares ModHG *sperren*, etc. (PIE *√spʰerH '(mit dem Fuß) stoßen', ²LIV, 585f. without Toch.).

prek- 'ask (for)' → *pärk-* 'id.'

^Apros- 'sich schämen', 'feel ashamed' (itr) (a/-/-)

        Prs II (m) —;-,-, *prosantär* Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part *prosmāṃ*

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf —

        Sub II — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II *proṣlune*

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

ETYM. According to J. Katz, apud Ringe, 2000, 127, to be derived from a PIE root *√preu̯s 'burn', the semantic development having been "'be ashamed' ← *'blush' ← 'burn'". But the respective PIE root seems to have had the basic meaning 'spray' (see ²LIV, 493f.), the meaning 'burn' for this root is otherwise only attested late (for Skt. *ploṣati*, see EWAia II, 193 with ref.).

^Aplā- '?' (tr) (-/m/-)

        Prs — Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf —

        Sub V (m) —;-,-, *plāntär* Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt I in

        PPt *pāplo*

        Ipv —

TG, 453f. lists a root *^Aplā-* without translation on account of the forms Prs or Sub TA *plāntä* from A 359, 28 and PPt TA *pāplo* from A 359, 20 (note also *pā[p](l)o(s)* possibly to be restored in A 191 b 1). Couvreur, 1956, 80 interpreted TA *plāntä* as a metrically shortened form of TA *pällāntä* from *^Apäl^ā-* 'praise': TA *talkeyäntu tosäm plāntä* "they praise these sacrifices". Although this makes some sense semantically (the preceding Skt. version is lost), I cannot find a parallel for CäC_iC_iV- > CC_iV- in TA metrical texts. On the other hand, a PPt TA *pāplo* can only belong to a preterit stem *^Aplā-* and not to *^Apäl^ā-* (Couvreur did not present an explanation for this PPt). If TA *pā[p](l)o(s)* is indeed to be restored in A 191 where it is parallel to the nom.sg.fem. PPt TA *tātwsus* 'burned', one may think of a meaning '± offer', i.e., a verb having as object 'sacrifice, libation'. *^Aplā-* can also continue PT *plāyā-*, *plāwā-*, and *plāw'ā-*; see Hilmarsson, 1996, 184f. on similarly structured *^Aksā-*.

plāk- act. 'einverstanden sein', 'Einverständnis erhalten', 'agree', 'receive agreement', mid. 'um Einverständnis bitten', 'ask for permission' (itr) (a/a/m)

Prs VIII (a) — Imp —;-,-, *plakṣiyeṃ*
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub I (a) -,-, *plākäṃ;* — Opt —
            Ger II *plākälle* (MQ) Abstr II — Priv *amplākätte*
            Inf *plāktsi*
Pt III (m) -, *plāksatai-me,-;* —
PPt *paplāku* (MQ)
Ipv III (m) *plāksar,-*

Pace WTG, 264, there is no intransitive grundverb paradigm consisting of a Prs XII, the Priv *amplākätte*, and a Pt I *plaka* (sic). The alleged Prs XII form *plākäntär* in PK AS 12J a 5 has rather to be read *[sklo]käntär* (see Couvreur, 1954, 84). The newly attested 3.sg. Sub *[plāk]äṃ* in PK NS 95b 2 proves that the root had an athematic subjunctive stem of Class I (see Pinault, 2000, 82 and 92): *kary[o]r [plāk]äṃ* "si'l se met d'accord sur l'achat". The respective athematic Ger II *plākälle* is found in PK AS 12D a 4 (MQ, unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), and the Priv *amplākätte* 'without permission, not having been permitted' is certainly to be assigned to this Sub I stem (see Hilmarsson, 1991, 91f.). The expected Pt III stem is attested by the 2.sg. Pt *plāksatai-me* in KVāc 19 b 4 (Schmidt, 1986, 52; for the passage, see also Pinault, 2005, 510), and the respective PPt *paplāku* 'agreed' can be found in THT 4001 a 5: *ṣamāne paplāku* "the monk (has) agreed" (reading according to K. T. Schmidt, p.c.). *plāksar* in 108 a 2 was reasonably analyzed as a respective 2.sg. Ipv III by Pinault, 2005, 508ff. Finally, the alleged *ā*-preterit *plaka* that was said to be found in the monastery record 491 Kol. III a 1, according to Sieg, 1950, 222f., followed by WTG, is completely unclear, because the two preceding forms, i.e., *ece mlaṣe* are hapax legomena.

= ᴬ*plāk-* mid. 'um Einverständnis bitten', 'ask for permission' (itr) (-/-/m)
        Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt III (m) -,-, *plāksāt;* —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. Hackstein, 1995, 115, correctly argues that the verb is not a "Kausativum" (pace the manuals) and that its valency is rather intransitive, the meaning being 'agree, be in accordance with'. As for recently published *kary[o]r plākäṃ* (as per Pinault, 2000, 101), *kary[o]r* may function as subject, and the phrase to be translated: "a purchase will be agreed upon". The middle forms always have the special meaning 'ask for permission to become a monk/nun'; see Schmidt, 1974, 422, and Schmidt 1986, 18 and 86. Eᴛʏᴍ. Lat. *placēre*

'please' is certainly a cognate of this root; see Hackstein, 1995, 116f.; Adams, DoT, 423f.; ²LIV, 485f. (*√pleh₃k 'zufrieden machen, gefallen'); de Vaan, 2008, 469 (*√pleh₂/₃k).

plātk- → *plätk-* 'overflow, develop, arise'

plānt⁽ᵃ⁾- 'vergnügt sein', 'rejoice, be glad' (itr) (m/a/a)

      Prs IV (m) *plontomar,-, plontotär;-,-, plontontär* Imp *plontimar,-,-;* —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part *plontomane* (MQ)
           Ger I *plontolle* Abstr I —
      Sub V (a) —; *plāntam,-,-,* Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf *plāntatsi*
      Pt I (a) -,-, *plānta;* —
      PPt *paplāntau | paplāntaṣ*
      Ipv —

The 1.sg. Prs *plontomar* is attested in PK AS 17I b 5, the 1.sg. Imp *plontimar* in PK AS 13H.1 a 3, *plontomane* in THT 1165 frg. 2 a 1, the 1.pl. Sub *plāntam* in PK AS 17C a 5 (all PK texts above are unpublished, all readings according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; *plontimar* is also listed in TEB II, 216 without ref.), the Ger I *plontolle* in THT 1446 a 2, and the Inf *plāntatsi* in THT 1235 a 1; the subjunctive stem has persistent initial accent. The PPt *paplāntaṣ* is, e.g., found in PK AS 17A b 2 (Pinault, 1984b, 169).

KAUSATIVUM I 'Vergnügen bereiten', 'make glad' (tr) (—)

      Prs — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv IV (m) *plāntaṣar-me* (sic);-

= ᴬ*plānt⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'vergnügt sein', 'rejoice, be glad' (itr) (m/a/-)

      Prs IV (m) -, *planttār,-;-,-, plantantär* Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part *plaṃtmāṃ*
           Ger I — Abstr I —
           Inf *plantatsi*
      Sub V (a) -,-, *plāntaṣ;-, plāntac,-* Opt —;-,-, *plāntiñc*
           Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt I in
      PPt *pāpläntu*
      Ipv —

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'Vergnügen bereiten', 'make glad' (tr) (m/-/m)

        Prs VIII (m) -,-, *plāntäṣtär;* — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt IV (m) —;-,-, *plāntṣānt*
        PPt —
        Ipv —

TA *plāntäṣtär* is a passive (cf. Schmidt, 1974, 245f.), and this may also hold for TA *plāntṣānt* in YQ 24 b 1 (see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 164). Eᴛʏᴍ. A cognate of Lat. *splendere* 'shine' (*√splend 'glänzen, hell sein/werden', ²LIV, 582), according to Adams, DoT, 425; Hackstein, 2003, 184 objects to this etymology for the reason that it would require PIE *-d- > PT *-t-, but PIE *-nd- > Tocharian -nt- seems to be also found in *spänt⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'trust'. Accordingly, one could guess that the fate of PIE *(-)d- to undergo in (pre-)PT before turning into either zero or *ts-/ś-* has been to become a voiced fricative, and that PIE *-d- escaped this process precisely in the position after *-n-, which is indeed an environment adverse to spirantization of voiced obstruents from a typological point of view (see, e.g., Méndez Dosuna, 1993, 104).

pläṅk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'zum Verkauf kommen, stehen', 'come up, be for sale' (itr) (m/-/a)

        Prs III (m) -,-, *pläṅketär;* — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf *pläṅkātsi*
        Pt I (a) -,-, *plaṅka;-,-, pläṅkāre/pläṅkire*
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The preterits *plaṅka* and *pläṅkāre* are often attested in monastery records of the Paris series PK Cp (= DA M 507); see Couvreur, 1954, 89f. The informal variant 3.pl. Pt *pläṅkire* is found on the verso side of a painted wooden tablet that was apparently reused as a letter (= HWP 28, transcription by M. Peyrot, p.c.): *mā ṣ yakwi alyi pläṅkire* "the male horses were not on sale".

Aɴᴛɪɢʀᴜɴᴅᴠᴇʀʙ 'verkaufen', 'sell' (tr) (x/a/a)

        Prs VIII (x) -,-, *plaṅkṣäṃ; pläṅksem,-,-* | *pläṅsemar* (sic),-,-; — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I *pläṅkṣalle* Abstr I —
        Sub II (a) -,-, *plyañcän;* — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II *plyäñcalñe* Priv —

Inf *plyaṃssi/plyasi*
Pt III (a) *pleṅkuwa,-, plyeṅksa/pleksa*; *plyeṅkam,-, plyeṅkare* (sic)
PPt in *peplyaṅkor*
Ipv VI *peplyaṅke*; —

The 1.pl. Prs *plaṅksem* is attested in THT 4001 a 6 and a 8 (reading according to K. T. Schmidt, p.c.). The Ger I *mläṅkṣalle* in 64 a 6 is to be emended to *pläṅkṣalle* (see TochSprR(B) ad 64 a 6). The 3.sg. Sub *plyañcän* is found in PK NS 95 a 4 and a 5, the Abstr *plyäñcalñe* in PK NS 95 a 4, and the Inf *plyaṃssi* in PK NS 95 a 3 (see Pinault, 2000, 82). The attestations of the finite preterit come from unpublished business documents from the Paris collection; see Couvreur, 1954, 89f. The Ipv *peplyaṅke* is attested in THT 1548 frg. b b 3 and b 4 (also listed in TEB II, 217 without ref.); a PPt *peplyaṅku* is only listed in TEB I, 250, § 445 without ref., but there is a respective absolutive attested in PK LC XXXVI, 5: *ysāre-peplyaṅkorṣṣeṃ* (obl.pl.) 'pertaining to the sale of grain' (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; also cited by Bernhard, 1958, 111). Owing to the fact that the verb is quite often attested in documents of profane nature, there are many phonological informal-style variants: Inf *plyasi* in Ot. 12.9 (see Schmidt, 1986a, 648); 1.sg. Pt *pleṅkuwa* (SI B Toch./11, 5; see Pinault, 1998, 8, and in PK Cp 39-43 a 8 unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c., cf. also Schmidt, 1985, 433 with a wrong line number); 3.sg. Pt *pleksa* (see Schmidt, 1986a, 641). The 3.pl. Pt *plyeṅkare* is attested in a business document from the Paris collection (see Schmidt, 1986a, 648). On alleged 1.sg. Pt *pleṅkawa* (as read by Couvreur, 1954 in St IA Kucha 0191, 4), see Schmidt, 1985, 433, who proposes restoration to *pleṅk(u)wa*. ETYM. According to Pinault, 1994c, 366f., we may be dealing with a nasal present *linek-ti built from the root PIE *√leik̑ 'feil sein/feilbieten' (²LIV, 406, without Toch.) compounded with the preverb *pe (> Hitt. *pē* 'away'); similarly Adams, DoT, 426f. (both scholars also pointing to Lat. *polliceor* 'offer' as a possible parallel).

ᴬpläṅkᵃ- '± zwicken', '± pinch' (?) (—)

```
        Prs V — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part pläṅkāmāṃ
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I in
        PPt pāpläṅku
        Ipv —
```

SEM. According to Couvreur, 1956, 69, the verb denotes 'zwicken, einklemmen, befestigen'; similarly TEB II, 121 ('zupfen'), and such a meaning is indeed what the contexts seem to suggest: TA *pāpläṅkuṣ* in A 4 b 3 is parallel to TA *kākoṣtuṣ* 'hit'; the PPt in A 171 b 5 refers to TA *klośnaṃ* 'in the ears'.

plätk- 'hervortreten, entstehen', 'overflow, develop, arise' (itr) (-/a/a)

> Prs II — Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part *plyetkemane*
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
> Sub I (a) -,-, *pletkäṃ;* — Opt —;-,-, *placyeṃ*
>> Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
>> Inf —
> Pt III (a) —;-,-, *pletkar-c*
> PPt *plätku* (S) | *plätkweṣne* (MQ)
> Ipv —

The *m*-Part *plyetkemane* could formally belong to both a Prs II and a Prs III, but Sub I excludes Prs III. A 3.sg. Sub *pletkäṃ* has to be emended in 591 b 6 (from *ṣletkäṃ*).

= ᴬ***plätk-*** 'anschwellen', 'swell' (itr) (—)

> Prs — Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
>> Inf —
> Sub — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II —
> Pt III in
> PPt *paplätku*
> Ipv —

The phrase TA *ṣpät paplätkunt* = Skt. *saptotsadaḥ* 'seven swellings' is attested in A 213 a 4, the parallel YQ 14 a 1, and in addition in YQ 12 b 1 and b 4; on the form, see Melchert, 1978, 118ff.

Eᴛʏᴍ. The root is usually viewed together with the TA root ᴬ*plutk-* (now also attested in TB) that has roughly the same meaning as ᴬᴮ*plätk-* (see below s.v. *plutk-* '± (a)rise?'). The semantics of both verbs are ably discussed by Melchert, 1978, 118ff., who derives both verbs ultimately from a PIE root *√bʰel(h₁) 'swell; gush forth' (not in ²LIV, 87). More precisely, he first derives ᴬᴮ*plätk-* from a *-sk̂e/o- present stem of a dental extension of the root *bʰl̥(h₁)-D-sk̂e/o- and ᴬ*plutk-* likewise from a root variant *√bʰleu̯-D-sk̂e/o-; finally, however, he toys with the idea that ᴬ*plätk-* developed out of ᴬ*plutk-* by pointing to TA "*papyätku* for *papyutku*", although he does not seem to make such a proposal for TB *plätk-* as well. Alternatively, Hackstein, 2002, 8 sets up PIE *pl̥th₂-sk̂e/o- from PIE *√pleth₂ 'breit werden, sich ausbreiten' (²LIV, 486f., without Toch.); this etymology goes back to Schneider, 1941, 48f. Somewhat similarly to Melchert, Adams, DoT, 427f. suggests to derive the two roots *plätk-* and ᴬ*plutk-* 'step forth' from one single pre-PT root with *u̯*-diphthong, the zero grade of which would have resulted in PT *ä by sound law, and PT *äw by the usual analogical reshaping of a root vowel *ä alternating with *æ/äw, and which could derive from a PIE root "bʰleud-" (cf. ²LIV, 90: *√bʰleu̯dh₂ 'zerfließen') otherwise attested in Gk. φλυδάω 'have an excess of

moisture, overflow'; in the end, however, he rather opts for PIE *√pleth₂, so that he could connect *plätk-* with another root, viz. a root *plātk-* 'spread (out)' (with question mark), according to DoT, 424 probably implied by the three nominal forms and hapax legomena *platäṃkam(o)*, *platkāre*, and "possibly" *platkye* (if the word separation is correct). However, *plataṃkamampa* attested in 330 a 5 is rather to be analyzed as a compound *platáṃ-kāmā-* (of the type °*rita-*, on which see Malzahn, in print). The passage comes from a commentary to Pāt 71 (the rule about the prohibition of traveling together with bandits; on the preceding passage, see Schaefer, 1997, 167ff.) and it has an Old Turkish gloss, which Maue, 2009, 22 translates "mit den Verschwindenden(?)". Since the passage *enestaine plataṃkamampa* refers to a kind of criminal company a monk must not travel together with, one may think of a meaning 'with those who carry words (in secret)', i.e., 'spies' (cf. Adams, ²DoT, s.v. *plata-kama-**).

plu- 'schwimmen, schweben', 'float, fly, soar' (itr) (a/a/a)

        Prs VIII (a) -,-, *pluṣäṃ/pluṣa-ñ;-,-, plusem* Imp -,-, *pluṣṣi-ñ* (sic);—
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub I (a) -,-, *plyewä-ñ;*— Opt -,-, *pluwi;*—
                Ger II — Abstr II *pluwälyñe* Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt III (a) -,-, *plyeᵤ̑sa/plyewsa;*—
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *pluṣa(ṃ)-ñ* is attested in PK AS 17C b 2 (sometimes also quoted as PK 17.3), the 3.pl. Prs *plusem* in PK AS 16.8 a 5 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c., and K. T. Schmidt, apud Hackstein, 1995, 95f. contra Couvreur, 1954, 84, who read *pluṣar-ñ*). *pluṣā-ne* in 375 b 4 was emended to *pluṣī-ne* by Sieg apud WTG, 107, § 107, fn. (see also Hackstein, 1995, 93 with fn. 162 and 95f.). The 3.sg. *plyewä(ṃ)-ñ* in PK AS 17C a 5 is Sub; see Hackstein, 1995, 94f. *[p]luṣteṃ* in 72, 2 ("vermutlich für *pluṣt teṃ*", as per TochSprR(B)) could attest to a 2.sg. Prs *pluṣt*, but this analysis is far from certain. The 3.sg. Opt *p(lu)wi* (a reading *p(lyu)wi* is also possible) is, in my opinion, attested in 100 b 2 (TochSprR(B) ad 100 b 2, fn. 19 proposes *[p](lu)wi*; Couvreur, 1954c, 106 does not translate this particular passage); in this text, Indra tests the character of the Bodhisattva who rather considers it possible that a couple of quite unnatural things might happen, than his desire of hearing a word of dharma teaching will cease: 100 b 1f. *walo ṣlentso śpālmeṃ su pi(tt)[s](au) menā[k]* [b 2] – – – *[p](lu)wi teteka* "the splendid king of the mountain [is rather] like an eyelash/trifle, (rather) would suddenly fly/float ..." (for *pittsau* 'eyelash, trifle', see Malzahn, 2005, 391f.). The subjunctive stem seems to have persistent initial accent. The 3.sg. Pt *plyewsa* with palatalized root initial is now actually attested four times: the MQ form *plyeᵤ̑sa* in 365 a 3

(late archaic ductus) was already listed by the manuals; *plyews=iprerne* in SI P/2 = Pe 2 a 2 is analyzed as consisting of a 3.sg. Pt *plyewsa* by Stumpf, 1971a, 103 and Hackstein, 1995, 92 (the manuals took the form to be an infinitive); the form is further attested in PK AS 17A a 6 (see Pinault, 1984b, 169), and now also in THT 1551 b 3 (apparently also cited by Thomas, 1968a, 213 without ref.).

KAUSATIVUM I 'schweben lassen', 'let fly, soar' (tr) (—)

   Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub IXb — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf *plyustsi*
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —

= *ᴬplu-* 'schweben', 'fly, soar' (itr) (-/-/a)

   Prs I — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part *plumāṃ*
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt I (a) —;-,-, *plawar*
   PPt —
   Ipv —

SEM. See the detailed discussion by Hackstein, 1995, 92ff. There is only one single root *plu-* with both the meaning 'float, swim' and 'fly'. ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√pleu̯ 'schwimmen, schweben' (²LIV, 487f.); see Hackstein, 1995, 96ff.; Adams, DoT, 428. Kümmel, ²LIV, 488, fn. 6 wants to derive the TB Sub I and the TA Prs I from a PIE Narten present (pace Bock, 2008, 332, fn. 758, the fact that *plyewä-ñ* is Sub does not speak against setting up a Narten formation), but with regard to the durative semantics of the root, one should rather have expected a lengthened-grade aorist (as assumed by Peters, 2006, 337f., fn. 20).

plutk- '± hervortreten?', '± (a)rise?' (?)

   Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —

Pt III in
PPt *plutku*
Ipv —

The form is a hapax in THT 1371 frg. g b 2: //// *śatomñesa kauṣ̠ plutku* •
"over the richness (or better: treasures) risen high" (newly attested *śatomñe* is
apparently an Abstr derived from *śāte* 'rich'; note the eastern dialectal features
-om- for *-au-* and *-ś#* for *-c#*). The formation of the PPt presupposes Pt III,
which is actually attested in TA.

= ^A*plutk-* '± hervortreten', '± (a)rise' (itr) (-/-/a)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt III (a) -,-, *plyocksā-m*;—
        PPt —
        Ipv —

KAUSATIVUM I '± heraustreten lassen', '± protrude, let flow out' (tr) (-/-/a)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II (a) —;-,-, *paplutkār-äṃ*
        PPt —
        Ipv —

SEM. The verb has roughly the same meaning as ^B*plätk-*, and like this it is also
intransitive (see also TEB I, 251, § 445, fn. 3), but there is some discussion with
respect to the exact meaning of the verb ^A*plutk-*. The Pt III TA *plyocksā-m*
attested in A 395 b 2f. seems to be intransitive: *mäṃtne nimittājñes brāmnāśśi*
śrāvasti riyā pre säm maṇḍal plyocksām tmä(k) ------ (manä)rkāṃ cam
maṇḍlac kātse wāntaṃ "[a]ls der Zauberkreis vor der Stadt Śrāvastī von den
vorzeichenkundigen Brahmanen fertiggestellt war, führten sie sogleich ... den
Knaben an den Zauberkreis heran" (Krause, 1955, 40; followed by Carling,
2000, 338); TEB II, 34, fn. 10 translates TA *plyocksā-m* here by "ihnen
hervortrat". Differently, Melchert, 1978, 119: "[a]s before the city Śrāvasti of
the n. brahmins the *maṇḍala* arose before them, then they led the boy up to
the *maṇḍala*". Melchert argues that the *maṇḍala* "[r]ather (...) rises before
them as they walk towards it". The Pt II TA *paplutkār-äṃ* in A 356 b 5 is not
entirely clear: A 356 b 4f. *cam klopyo āṣānikyāp bodhisatvāp puk (ma)rmañ*
protkar-äṃ – – tkanā klā • *pontsāṃ kapśiññac śotracc oki* [b 5] *– – r pärne*
paplutkār-äṃ kakäl [t]o–m klopant wasäṃ moṣaṃ. Stumpf, 1971, 33

translates: "Zum ganzen Körper traten sie [scil. die Adern] ihm (offenbar) — wie zum ... — heraus". Melchert, 1978, 119 restores *[ysā]r* at the beginning of b 5 and translates: "[b]y that suffering all the veins of the venerable *Bodhisattva* were blocked ... he fell to the ground. They caused his blood to flow out into his whole body as into a ... He bore those sufferings for our sake", and although TochSprR(A) indicates two unreadable akṣaras at the beginning of line 5, a look at the original manuscript indeed shows that the restoration of one single akṣara ⟨ysā⟩ would fit the lacuna. ETYM. Melchert, 1978, 119f. derives the root from a dental extension *b^hleu̯-D- from PIE √*b^hleu̯, a root variant of PIE *√b^hel(h_1) 'swell; gush forth; bloom' that is also continued in *AB*plätk- 'overflow, develop, arise; swell'; see above. The alternative root etymology with PIE *√pleth$_2$ 'spread, extend' (see the ref. in Adams, DoT, 427f.) may go well with *plätk-* but is problematic with this root, because the *u*-vocalism of the root would be unexplained (see Melchert, 1978, 119f.).

M

*A***malyw-** 'crush' → *mely-* 'id.'

māṃ(t)s$^{(ä)}$**-** 'unglücklich sein', 'be sorrowful' (itr) (m/m/m)

Prs II (m) -,-, *memṣtär*;-,-, *memsentär* Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Prs VI (m) -,-, *mantsanatär*; — Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part *mantsanamane*
Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub I/II (m) — Opt *memṣīmar*,-,-; —
Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
Inf —
Sub V (m) —;-,-*māntsantär* Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II *māṃtsalyñe* Priv —
Inf —
Pt I (m) -,-, *mantsāte*; —
PPt —
Ipv —

The *m*-Part *mantsanamane* is attested in PK NS 407 a 1 (Thomas, 1972, 168), the 1.sg. Opt *memṣīmar* in PK AS 5B a 1 (Pinault, 1990, 165). The 3.sg. Prs *mantsanatär* is arguably also attested in 622 a 5. The 3.pl. Sub *māntsantär* is found in PK AS 15J b 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; also listed in TEB II, 220 without ref.). In 208 b 3 one has to read either a 3.sg. Pt *mantsa[te]* or to restore a 2.sg. Pt *mantsa[t](ai)*, the 3.sg. Pt *mantsā[t]e* is also attested in 415 a 5 (not in WTG). The *ā*-subjunctive has persistent initial accent. The noun *memtsi* 'grief, misery' is most likely not an Inf from this root,

but a formation of the type *nāki*; see Malzahn, 2005, 397. ETYM. Usually be derived from PIE *√menth₂ 'quirlen, umrühren' (²LIV, 438f.), cf. Adams, DoT, 454; Malzahn, 2005, 397; Peters, 2006, 342, fn. 34. Both Malzahn and Peters set up a pre-PT present formation *mont(h₂)i̯e/o-, but this solution would imply that the stem allomorph resulting from *mont(h₂)i̯e- had been reinterpreted as an athematic stem, to judge from both the abstract *meṃtsi* (which seems to attest to a Sub I stem *meṃts-*, cf. Malzahn, l.c.) and the clear Prs II form *meṃṣtär* with palatalization of the root-final *-s-*. Maybe the stem comes rather from a pre-PT Narten formation in *-s- *mēn-s-ti, built exactly like the *ḱlēu̯-s-ti underlying *klyaus-*/ *ᴬklyos-*. At any rate, the various forms from this root provide the key for a correct understanding of the *-ṃs-* found without any exception or variant showing expected *-nts-* in the thematic paradigms from the roots *lāṃs-* 'work on, perform, accomplish, build' and *ṣäṃs-* 'count (as)' before non-palatalizing *-e-* from PIE *-o-: with respect to the root of this entry, the original distribution by sound law no doubt had been *-nts-* before any non-palatalizing vowel (cf., e.g., *āntse* 'shoulder' with *-nts-* before *-e-* from pre-PT *-o-) vs. *-ṃṣ-*, but evidently thanks to intra-paradigmatic leveling, in the thematic present made from this root here the original variation pre-TB *-ṃṣä-* vs. *-ntse-* to be expected was turned into less divergent *-ṃṣ-* vs. *-ṃse-* (as a corollary, contrarily to the claim made by Adams, DoT, 464 and 654, *mīsa* 'flesh' can only derive from a pre-TB proto-form lacking a nasal in front of the *-s-* completely, no doubt as the consequence of an *irregular* dissimilatory loss of the second *-m-* standing immediately in front of the *-s-* in the PIE ancestor *memso-); the thematic paradigms from the roots *lāṃs-* and *ṣäṃs-* then just show the same kind of paradigmatic leveling as clearly found in the Prs II from this root.

ᴬmālkᵃ- 'melken', 'Milch geben', 'milk', 'produce milk' (?) (-/-/m)

> Prs — Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
>> Inf —
> Sub V — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II *mālklune*
> Pt I (m) —;-,-, *mālkant*
> PPt —
> Ipv —

SEM. According to TEB II, 124, the active had the transitive meaning 'milk' and the middle the intransitive meaning 'produce milk'. Strictly speaking, a transitive meaning is only attested for the Abstr TA *mālklune* 'act of milking'; the only finite form, the middle Pt, is indeed intransitive: A 63 b 5 *sne-mālkluneyo mālk(a)nt ko(w)i* "ohne Melken pflegten die Kühe Milch zu geben"; see Thomas, 1966, 273 and Schmidt, 2004, 311, the latter with reference to the Sanskrit parallel version, which has a middle Skt. *duduhire* 'produced

milk by themselves'. ETYM. Evidently a denominative to a noun similar to TA *malke* 'milk' (~ TB *malkwer*) from *√h₂melĝ 'melken' (cf. ²LIV, 279).

^{A}*māsk$^{(a)}$-* 'schwierig sein', 'be difficult, present problems' (itr) (m/x/m)

       Prs VII (m) — Imp -,-, *māsäṃśāt*,—
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
           Inf —
       Sub V (x) -,-, *māskaṣ*,— | —;-,-, *māskantär* Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt I (m) —;-,-, *māskant*
       PPt *māmäsku*
       Ipv —
KAUSATIVUM I '?' (?) (—)
       Prs VIII — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I *māskäṣlā* Abstr I —
           Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

TA *māskäṣlā* in A 230 a 3 is a substantivized Ger I, so that the basic meaning of what looks like a Kaus. I stem is difficult to establish; Thomas, 1952, 54 with fn. 2 translates "infolge des Vertauschenmüssens"; Peyrot (in print a) now rather proposes "because of words that presented difficulties".

SEM./ETYM. WTG, 267 and TEB II, 125, 221 take the root for a TA equivalent of *mäsk-* '(ex)change' which is claimed by these manuals to be a kausativum of ^{AB}*mäsk^{ä}-* 'be'. Melchert, 1978, 106f. objected to this traditional view by pointing out that TA *māsk-* does not denote 'exchange', but rather 'switch, juggle', and connected it therefore rather with Lith. *móju* 'wave, signal with the hand' etc. (PIE *√meh₂ 'Zeichen geben', ²LIV, 425 without Toch.). Peyrot, in print a, now proposes a meaning 'be difficult' for ^{A}*māsk$^{(a)}$-* and connects it with PIE *√meh₃ 'tire, disturb'.

mäk$^{(a)}$- 'laufen', 'run' (itr) (m/m/m)

       Prs V (m) — Imp *makoymar* (Š),-,-;—
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub V (m) *makamar*,-,-;— Opt -,-, *mäkoytär* (MQ);—
           Ger II — Abstr II *makalñe* Priv —
           Inf *makatsi*

Pt I (m) —;-,-, *mkānte*
PPt *mkauwa*
Ipv —

The 1.sg. (probably Sub) *makamar* is attested in the Stein text Or. 8212/1668(C) (= Jig.I.i.02) b 3. The 1.sg. *makoymar* in 78 a 4 is not Opt, but Imp (see most recently Schmidt, 2001, 307f.), so that the form proves that the present stem had root-initial accent like the subjunctive stem (differently, W. Winter, p.c., proposes a misspelled Prs VII *ma<ṅ>koymar;*). The 3.sg. *mäkoytär* in 295 a 7 is Opt, *mä(k)oytär* in 129 b 7 (not in WTG) is unclear. *maś(c)e(r)* in 108 a 5 is not a form of this root (as proposed by WTG, 265), but an informal-style form from *yām-* 'do'; see most recently Peyrot, 2008, 160. The Abstr II is attested in the derived adjective *makalñetse*, and *[m](a)k(a)lñe* may also be restored in PK NS 107 a 2, where it serves as the equivalent of Skt. *sarit-* 'river' (see Thomas, 1978, 107). The 3.pl. Pt *mkānte* is found in PK AS 15A b 6 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c., also listed in TEB II, 220 without ref.). The verbal noun *mäkorm(eṃ)* is attested in PK AS 6A as equivalent of Skt. *saṃdhāvitvā* 'having passed through' (see Pinault, 1990a, 57), and the PPt *mkauwa* in PK NS 51 a 4 (see Pinault, 1995a).

KAUSATIVUM I 'zum Laufen bringen', 'make run' (tr) (—)

Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub IXb — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf *makästsi*
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

ETYM. According to Adams, DoT, 450f., to be derived from PIE *√meu̯g 'losbinden, abstreifen' (²LIV, 443f. without Toch.). According to Malzahn/Peters, forthc., rather to be connected with Greek μαχ- 'fight' (which is a medium tantum as in Tocharian; cf. μάχλος 'lewd [said of women]', ModHG '*läufig*'), and to be derived from a PIE root *√megʰH 'run' (Greek μαχε- < *mekʰa- via vowel metathesis).

mäṅk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'unterlegen sein, einen Verlust erleiden, Mangel haben an', 'be inferior, lack, be deprived of' (itr) (m/x/a)

Prs III (m) -,-, *mäṅketär;* — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub V (x) —; *mäṅkāmo,-,-|-,-, mäṅkātär;-,-, mäṅkāntär* Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *mäṅkālñe* Priv —
        Inf —
Pt I (a) *mäṅkāwa,-, mäṅkā-ñ;* —

PPt *mäṅkau*
Ipv —

Schmidt, 1974, 47f., fn. 3, points to the possibility that *mäṅkāmo* in 231 b 5 may also be a verbal adjective with the meaning 'beabsichtigend', but a 1.pl. does not only make perfect sense in this passage (as can also be inferred from Schmidt's own translation), what is more, all *mo*-adjectives with a clear derivational history are based on a present stem (see chap. Sub VII 22.2.3.1., fn. 5). A 3.sg. middle Sub *mäṅkātär* is listed in TEB I, 228, § 412,2 without ref., and such a form can be read in THT 1466 a 3 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). In addition, Schmidt, 1974, 109 cites a passage *śātre lauke mäṅkātär-me* "Euch fehlt es weit[hin] an Getreide" with the signature "X 369" (now = THT 1574 a 2), but — as correctly cited in TEB II, 74 —, this form, in fact, has to be read *mäṅketär-me*. The Abstr *mäṅkālñe* seems attested in THT 1340 frg. d b 2 (pace Tamai 2007a, s.v., I do not interpret the sign above the *ñ* as virāma), and *(mäṅkā)lñe* is also restored by Pinault, 1994, 154 in PK NS 58 b 3. The 1.sg. Pt *maṅkāwa* is found in THT 1249 a 2, and a 3.sg. Pt *maṅkā-ñä* probably in the small fragment THT 2667 b 2 (without context, provenance unknown).

KAUSATIVUM I 'überwinden', 'overcome' (tr) (-/a/-)
    Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub IXb (a) — Opt *mäṅkäṣṣim*,-,-; —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

= ᴬ*mäṅk(a)- 'unterlegen sein', 'be inferior' (?) (—)
    Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
    Sub V — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II *mäṅkālune*
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

KAUSATIVUM I 'überwinden', 'overcome' (tr) (—)
    Prs VIII — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf *mäṅkässi*
    Sub — Opt —

              Ger II — Abstr II —
     Pt —
     PPt —
     Ipv —

SEM. The basic meaning is 'be inferior' → 'experience a loss, lack', the oppositional transitive means 'overcome' (e.g., the *kleśas* in S 7 a 2). The meaning 'schuldig sein', 'beschuldigen' given in TG, 454 is only attested by the noun TA *maṅk* 'lack, fault' (~ TB *meṅki* 'lack'). ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√menk 'lack' parallel to Germanic (Proto-Germ. *mangjan 'lack, miss'); see Adams, DoT, 452 (not in ²LIV).

mänt⁽ᵃ⁾- act. 'an-/umrühren; zerstören', 'stir; destroy', mid. 'zerstören' or
           'zerstört werden', 'aufgewühlt, mißgünstig gesinnt sein', 'destroy' or
           'be destroyed', 'be stirred, angry' (tr/itr) (x/x/a)
           Prs VI (a) (tr) -,-, *mintanaṃ*;— Imp — 'stir (clay)'
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
           Prs XII (x) (tr/itr) -,-, *mäntaṃ*;-,-, *mäntaññeṃ* 'destroy'
                | *mäntañemar*,-, *mäntantär*;— Imp -,-, *mäntañitär*;-,-,
                mäntañyentär 'be angry'
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *mäntalle* Abstr I —
           Sub V (x) (tr) -,-, *māntäṃ*;— | -,-, *mäntatär*;— 'destroy' Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *mäntalñe* Priv *amäntatte* 'not being angry'
                Inf *mäntatsi* 'stir', 'be angry'
           Pt I (a) *mantāwa*,-,-;-,-, *mantāre* 'destroy'
           PPt *mamāntau* | *mamāntaṣ* 'evil, malicious'
           Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs VI *mintanaṃ* is attested in a Berlin text edited by Thomas, 1987, 169ff. (now = THT 1459), which contains Pāt 19. The Pāli and Sanskrit parallel versions run (in translation): "if a monk pours or lets pour water containing living beings down on clay". All Indian versions show a form from the root Skt. √sic 'pour' in this passage. As per Hackstein, 1995, 20, fn. 8, the meaning of *mintanaṃ* seems to be 'rührt (Lehm mit Wasser) an'; as per Thomas, 1987, 175, immediately following *mān[t]a////* is best restored to *mān[t]a(tsi wat watkäṣṣäṃ)*, which then ought to be translated "(or lets) stir" (strangely enough, Thomas himself [1987, 174] evidently uses "anrühren" as a synonym of "berühren", i.e., "touch"). For the ending *-äṃ* of the 3.sg. Sub V *māntäṃ*, see chap. Sub I/V 18.2.1. A 3.sg. Opt *māntoy* is only listed in TEB I, 228, § 412,2 without ref. The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. The 1.sg. Pt *mantāwa* is found in THT 1295 b 3: *k̞uce kca palsko mantāwa* "whatever spirit I destroyed"; a 3.pl. Pt *mantāre* is only listed in TEB II, 220 without ref. Schmidt, 2001, 305, fn. 30 proposes to restore a 2.pl.mid. Prs VI (*mäntana)tär-ñ* in 79, 1

on the evidence of the parallel A 342 b [= a] 1 (note that *(māntana)tär* given in
the same footnote and in fn. 31 can only be a typo like TA "*māntā(cärñi)*" in
fn. 31). However, since we are not dealing with a metrical passage and
therefore do not know the exact number of syllables involved, the form can
also be restored to a 2.pl.mid. Prs XII *(mäntan)tär.*

= *ᴬmänt͡ᵇ-* act. 'zerstören', 'destroy', mid. 'zugrundegehen' or 'zerstört werden',
         'aufgewühlt, mißgünstig gesinnt sein', 'fall into ruin' or 'be
         destroyed', 'be stirred, angry' (tr/itr) (x/-/m)
         Prs V (x) (tr/itr) *mäntām,-,-;-,-, mänteñc* 'destroy' |
                 —;-, *mäntācär, mäntāntär* 'be angry', 'be destroyed'
                 Imp *mäñcāwe,-,-;-,-, mäñcānt* 'be angry'
                 nt-Part —
                 m-Part *mäntāmāṃ*
                 Ger I — Abstr I —
                 Inf *mäntātsi*
         Sub V — Opt —
                 Ger II — Abstr II *māntlune* 'malignity'
         Pt I (m) -,-, *māntat;-,-, māntant*
         PPt *māmäntu*
         Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. There is a concrete meaning 'stir' (object: 'clay') showing up in the TB
passage edited by Thomas, 1987, 169ff. From this concrete meaning the
meanings 'destroy' and 'be stirred, be resentful, be angry, feel malice' could
have been derived easily; see Hackstein, 1995, 20, fn. 8 with parallels. All
active forms are transitive and denote either 'stir' or 'destroy' (objects: H
149.add 113 b 1 "monasticism"; 3 b 7 and 35 b 2 "desire"; A 355 b 1 "the
boundary of sāṃvara"). The middle *māntatär* in 331 a 1 is used transitively (as
per Hackstein, 1995, 39) or as a passive (as per Winter, 2003a, 112 = 2005, 534).
The meaning 'be resentful, be angry, feel malice' is attested quite often (see the
passages in Schmidt, 1974, 163ff., and 489, fn. 2; to be added here is PK AS 18 a
5, for which see Thomas, 1979a, 239). The TA middle *mäntäntär* in A 337 b 6
has passive meaning as well or is an intransitive: *nkäṃsanträ puk śariräntu
mäntänträ puk ak* //// "all relics are destroyed/fall into ruin, all *ak...* are
destroyed/fall into ruin"; note that Hackstein, 1995, 86 takes TA *nkäṃsanträ*
for an intransitive by translating "es gehen zugrunde alle Reliquien". The Ger
mäntalle 'to be deleted' that is often attested in the grammatical text 551 is also
a morphologically problematic form. We are either dealing with a formation
of Prs XII form **mäntaññälle* reduced to *mäntalle* by haplology, or "mit
Assimilation [...] *ñ(ñ)ll > ll*", as in "**rinlle > rille*, ebenso *silyñe, saille*",
according to K. T. Schmidt, p.c. with ref. to WTG, 121, § 120. In WTG, 266 this
Ger is analyzed as a misspelled Sub V **mäntālle*, but this cannot be true,
because the form certainly conveys the meaning of a Ger I and therefore
should be derived from a present stem; on the text see Malzahn, 2007c, 375ff.
in detail. Couvreur, 1954, 91 sets up a separate root with the meaning 'delete'
for *mäntalle*, but this is unnecessary, because 'delete' is quite close to 'destroy'.
Eᴛʏᴍ. As first claimed by Thomas, 1987, 173ff., to be derived from PIE

*√menth₂ 'quirlen, umrühren' (²LIV, 438f.). According to Hackstein, 1995, 29f., this etymology is basically correct, but this scholar also claims that the two different kinds of nasal present stem formation (Prs VI and XII) and again the semantics of the root met in 331 a 1 and a 2 (which in his view is "'(Erde) aufreißen/-graben'") attest to influence from the similarly shaped PIE root "*math₂- 'reißen, rauben'" (*√meth₂ 'wegreißen' as per ²LIV, 442f.). The root variant *mint-* found in the Prs VI form *mintanaṃ* (by probably showing pre-PT *me- > TB *mi-*, see chap. Sound Laws 1.7.) seems to attest to preservation of full-grade *menth₂- until pre-PT times. Given the existence of a Prs VI in Tocharian B, the TA Prs V is probably best explained as a former Prs VI pre-TA *mäntnā-, which then may have turned into *mäntā-* by dissimilatory loss of the suffixal nasal; but the Prs V may also derive from a PIE present *menth₂-(e-)ti and thereby form a (near-)equation with Ved. *mánthati* (see Hilmarsson, 1991, 30). The Pt I possibly goes back to a Narten preterit *mēnth₂-, which would imply that it diachronically belongs to the *lyakāwa* type. This root furthermore ranks among those few that could use the same middle form both intransitively and transitively/passively.

män(t)s⁽ᵃ⁾- 'be sorrowful' → *mān(t)s⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'id.'

märk- '± besudeln', '± besmirch' (?) (—)
      Prs IXb — Imp —
          nt-Part *märkäṣṣeñca* (MQ)
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —
The *nt*-Part *markaṣṣeñca* is arguably attested in the small fragment THT 1227 frg. b a 2 (MQ character) without much context (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). One may restore to: //// *(ta)[ka]rṣ(k)eṃ markaṣṣeñca* • "besmirching the clear ...". The meaning is set up on the evidence of TA.
= ᴬ***märk-*** 'verwischen, besudeln', 'wegnehmen' 'smudge, besmirch',
      'take away' (tr) (-/-/a)
      Prs — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf —
      Sub I — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II *märklune* Priv —
      Pt III (a) -,-, *markäs*;—
      PPt —

Ipv —

SEM. The TA verbal root is left untranslated in the manuals (TG, 455). The abstract is attested by the privative compound TA *sne-märklune* found in A 359, 15, which translates preceding Skt. *ahāryo (nidhir ucyate)* 'not to be taken away'. Finite TA *markäs* is found in A 120 b 5: *tām praṣt penu sundari nandes pāpṣune markäs* "Zu dieser Zeit hatte Sundarī das sittliche Verhalten des Nanda weggenommen ..." (translation by Carling, 2000, 285). In TB, we have the following nominal forms that could belong to the same root: *snai-markär* = Skt. *anāvilaḥ* 'not bleary, clear', *snai-märkär* = Skt. *niṣkaluṣā* 'not muddy, not bleary' (see Thomas, 1977, 111). If all of these forms belong to the same root, we may be dealing with a basic meaning 'smudge, besmirch' that would have been further developed into 'make bleary, make clouded' → 'take away'. ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√h₂merĝ 'abstreifen, abwischen' (²LIV, 280f.).

***märtk*ᵃ-** '(Kopf) scheren', 'shave (the head)' (tr) (-/m/m)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V (m) —;-,-, *märtkantär* (MQ) Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *markalñe* (sic) Priv —
                Inf *markasi* (sic)
        Pt I (m) -,-, *märtkāte*; —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 3.pl. Sub is attested in THT 1859 b [recte a] 3 (archaic ductus): //// *martkantr=aṣca* (sic) (reading: D. Q. Adams, p.c., contra Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). The phrase *mā markalñ(esa)* as restored by TochSprR(B) in 309 a 4 (Š) translates Skt. *(na mu)ṇḍitena* 'not bald' (instr.sg.); Adams, DoT, 455 restores here an adj. *markalñ(etstse)*. The Inf *markasi* is arguably found in PK Cp 35, 46 and PK Cp 38, 41 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The subjunctive stem has persistent initial accent. A PPt *martkau* is probably attested in the small fragment THT 3080 a 4 without further context.

= ᴬ***märtk*ᵃ-** 'wegkratzen, (Kopf) scheren', 'scrape off, shave (the head)'

        (tr) (-/-/x)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I (x) -, *märtkāṣt*,-; — | —;-,-, *märtkānt*
        PPt *märtko*
        Ipv —

TEB II, 39 reads TA *[mä]r[t]kāṣt* in A 244 b 3 (= no. X, 10): TA *[mä]r[t]kāṣt (v)āsaṃ pältskäṣ* "you (sg.) ... the false beliefs (Skt. *vāsanā-*)". Schmidt, 1980a, 341ff. has identified the Toch. text as a translation of VAV 2.24, Skt. *sarvāraditadharmāya* (dat.sg.) "der alle Dharmas zersplittert" (see Hartmann, 1987, 103). The Skt. root √rad (from which BHS *āradita* is derived) has not only the meanings 'break, split, divide', but also 'scratch, scrape', so one may guess that the basic meaning of the Tocharian root has only been 'scrape (off)', and that as an intended calque or simply by error the Tocharian translator of VAV 2.24 used this Tocharian root basically denoting 'scrape (off)' in order to render √rad in a passage where this Sanskrit root actually denoted 'break, split'.

SEM. The middle TA *märtkānt* has direct-reflexive function 'shave one's own head'; see Schmidt, 1974, 324. ETYM. See the discussion in Adams, DoT, 455.

märs⁽ᵃ⁾- 'vergessen', 'forget' (tr) (m/x/a)

      Prs III (m) -,-, *märsetär;* — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I *märselle* Abstr I —
      Sub V (x) -, *mārsat* (MQ),-; — Opt *marsoym,-,-;* — | -,-, *marsoytär;* —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf *marsatsi* (MQ)
      Pt I (a) *märsāwa, märsasta, marsa;-,-, märsāre*
      PPt *märsau/märsau͜ᵤ* (MQ) | *märsoṣ*
      Ipv —

Beside a restored form in 121 a 7, the 3.sg. Prs *märsetär* is now also attested in THT 1323 frg. 1 b 3 (pace Tamai, 2007a, s.v.): *(a)lyek (·)o(–) kaṣṣiṃ marsetar* "the other ... is forgetting the teacher"; and also in THT 1566 a 3: *sū mā marsetar* "he does not forget". The 3.sg. Sub *mārsaṃ* in TEB I, 228, § 412,2 is probably only reconstructed on the basis of the attested optative, the middle 3.sg. Opt *[ma]rsoytar* is attested in THT 1468 a 4. The subjunctive shows ablaut and persistent initial accent. A 3.pl. Pt *märsāre* (MQ) is also found in THT 3597 (= Mainz 655, 1) a 7 (cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 273), and the PPt *(mä)[r]s(o)ṣ* is restored by TochSprR(B) in 46 b 1.

KAUSATIVUM IV 'vergessen machen', 'make forget' (tr) (-/-/x)

      Prs IXb — Imp —
           nt-Part *marsäṣṣeñca*
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf —
      Pt II (x) -,-, *myārsā-ne;* — | -, *myārsatai-me,-;* —
      PPt —
      Ipv —

An *m*-Part *marsässeñca* is only listed in TEB II, 221 without ref. (not in Dietz, 1981). Maybe the form refers to THT 1231 a 3. Even though from a paleographic point of view one has here rather to read *marmarṣṣañca laklenta*, such a form *marmarṣṣañca* does not make much sense, so that one may indeed think of an emendation to *mar<ṣa>{r}ṣṣ<e>ñca laklenta* "one who makes forget the sufferings" (the akṣaras ⟨ma⟩ and ⟨ṣa⟩ being easily subject to confusion).

= *Amärs*ᵃ- 'vergessen', 'forget' (tr) (a/a/a)

      Prs VI (a) —;-,-, *märsneñc* Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

            Inf —

      Sub V (a) —;-, *märsāc*,- Opt -, *märsit*,-;—

            Ger II — Abstr II —

      Pt I (a) -,-, *märs*;-,-, *mrasar*

      PPt *märso*

      Ipv —

ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√mers 'vergessen' (²LIV, 440f.); see Adams, DoT, 455f. According to Winter, 1980, 430 = 2005, 212, the TB Class III present replaced the nasal present found in TA(and also Armenian), and it is certainly true that the TB root does not behave like a typical Prs III root with respect to valency and subjunctive inflection (see chap. Prs III/IV). On the other hand, the root did not end in a laryngeal in PIE, and the Pt I found in both languages may have been based on an adverb similar to RV *mṛṣā* 'in vain' (cf. Jasanoff, 2003, 156), so that the nasal present found in Tocharian A probably was not an inherited formation either.

[*mäl-* 'overflow'; this root is set up for the TB adjective *mlamo* and some TA forms by Adams, DoT, 456. *mlamo* is a hapax in S 8 (= PK AS 4B) b 1 (see Thomas, 1966a, 180): • *mlam[o] tākoy-ñ ar(añ)[c](e)* "may my heart be(come) m.". According to Thomas, 1966a, 180, fn. 8, a reading *mlam[au]* is also possible, but such a form would not make much sense. A verbal adjective in *-mo* presupposes a present stem *mälä-*, because in all clear cases *mo*-adjectives are built to present stems; see chap. Sub VII 22.2.3.1, fn. 5. Traditionally, *mlamo* is analyzed as a cognate of *mäl*ᵃ- 'crush', but Adams, DoT, 456 and 479 claimed that the use of *mlamo* in S 8 resembles closest that of the TA forms TA *mlamāṃ* and TA *mlo*, and that all of them attest to a separate root *mäl-* 'overflow'. However, the TA forms in question can, in my opinion, indeed morphologically and semantically be derived from *Amäl*ᵃ- 'crush' (see below). *ṣañ läklenta warpatsi waśīr klautkoy-ñ arañce tsmoytär-ñ nete* • As for *mlamo*, a meaning 'overflowing' as suggested by Adams is not too fitting, because immediately before the sentence starting with *mlamo*, there we find the following two other wishes expressed (the first of them also concerning the heart of

the speaker): //// "In order to suffer my own sufferings, may my heart turn into a jewel, may my strength grow" (cf. also the translation by Adams, DoT, 479, who prefers 'diamond'); I think that with regard to these two preceding wishes, *mlamo* may be an adjective denoting 'hard', and 'hard' can have developed out of 'crushing' ("that what crushes"). Accordingly, I think *mlamo* may attest to a former Prs I stem *mälä- that had, of course, once belonged to the paradigm built from the root *mäl⁽ᵃ⁾- '(op)press, crush'.]

*mäl*ᵃˀ- 'schmelzen', 'melt' (?) (—)
      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt I in
      PPt *mloṣ*
      Ipv —

The PPt *mloṣ* is attested in KVāc 15 b 3 with the meaning "molten (said of copper)"; see Schmidt, 1986, 47 and 79. For isolated *mälṣälle* in 341 a 1, see *mil-* 'wound, damage'. A PPt **mlau* can regularly only belong to a root with A-character. In that case this root would be homonymous with *mäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'crush', but both roots may have had quite different kinds of paradigms. Eᴛʏᴍ. According to Schmidt, 1986, 133, the root is a cognate of ModHG *schmelzen*, and thus to be derived from PIE *√(s)meld 'weich werden' (²LIV, 431, without Toch.).

mäl⁽ᵃ⁾- 'zusammenpressen, bedrücken, zerquetschen', '(op)press, crush',
      mid. 'leugnen', 'deny' (tr) (m/-/-)
      Prs Xa (m) -,-, *mällāstär* (Š)/*mällastär* (MQ)/*mällästär* (MQ); —
            Imp -,-, *mälläṣṣitär* (MQ); —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub VI — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II *mällālñe* (MQ) Priv *amällatte* (MQ)
            Inf —
      Pt I (?) in
      PPt *mamālo* (MQ)
      Ipv —

Adams, 1989a, 12f. and DoT, 457 proposes to set up a separate root ²*mäl-* 'argue, dispute' (with question mark) on the evidence of *mällāsträ* in 63 b 7 (Š) and a possible nominal cognate for semantic and morphological reasons, but *mällāsträ* can be interpreted as form of a Prs Xa of a root with A-character written in the standard orthography (cf. Hackstein, 1995, 287ff.), and the

traditional translation 'denies' is not unreasonable in this passage (cf. Hackstein, 1995, 316). The MQ form *mällasträ* is attested two times: 127 a 7 *aisamñe cpi mällasträ* "he denies his knowledge" (see Hackstein, 1995, 316); H 149.add 8 (= IOL Toch 127) b 3 belongs to Pār 2 (the rule about the prohibition of stealing, cf. Pinault, 1988, 163, fn. 77), and has been misunderstood by Hilmarsson, 1996, 149f. The parts of this text separated by punctuation dots do not constitute a sentence, but are separate keywords from the casuistics of Pār 2. The forms preceding the verbal form in question, i.e., *snai-pewaṃ* 'without feet', etc., do not classify "thieves", but different kinds of stolen goods (cf. Pār 2, 4, 1). Consequently, H 149.add 8 b 3f. *klepe mällasträ • weṣperke ṣparkäṣṣäṃ • lykaṃ sompasträ* has to be translated: "(there is an offence, if) he (= the monk) denies the theft, makes the swag (?, hapax) disappear, (or) steals from thieves". As for the Imp *mälläṣṣitär* in 19 a 4 (MQ) and the 3.sg. Prs *mällastar* now attested in THT 1451 frg. c b 4 (MQ) without context, these two forms obviously show the substitution of stem-final accented (*)-ā- by -ä- that is also found with the Class IXa forms from *ārt(t)[a]*- and some other roots (see chap. Prs/Sub IX) — there is no need to assume that they belong to a Class Xb paradigm (as was already done by WTG, and most recently by Kim, 2007b, 69, fn. 7). The Sub VI with a root vowel -ā- due to ā-umlaut clearly seems to imply the existence of a Pt I having such a root vowel -ā- itself; otherwise one could hardly explain the presence of that root vowel -ā- in the Sub VI, which no doubt must have started out as PT *mälnā- with an original root vowel *-ä- still preserved in the Prs Xa (which must have started out as an -sk- enlargement of that nasal present PT *mälnā-), and to be expected in a Tocharian outcome of the inherited nasal present *ml̥-n-h₂- assumed by Hackstein, 1995, 316f. (but note the doubts about such a PIE nasal present expressed in ²LIV, 432f. and by Jasanoff, 2003, 65, fn. 5). As for such a Pt I PT 3.sg.act. *mālā, with regard to the fact that we are dealing here with a root in final *-h₂- there is then no need to assume a denominative origin for the whole form or at least a suffixal origin for the final *-ā; one can actually derive *mālā from a Narten preterit PIE *mēlh₂-t > PT *m'ælā with a root vocalism otherwise met in the *lyakāwa* type, but with a final *-ā of non-suffixal origin. Now beside a Narten preterit PT *m'ælā one should have expected a PPt PT *m'æm'äläwä, and I think this archaic PPt is actually found in the PPt *memīloṣepi* that synchronically belongs with a Prs VIII form 3.sg.act. *milṣäṃ* said to be built from a root *mil-* 'wound, damage', the -i- of which probably had replaced the expected -ä- that still seems to be seen in the Ger *mälṣälle* 341 a 1 (MQ) precisely as a result of analogical influence from the PPt *memīloṣepi*. On the other hand, as soon as PT *m'ælā had turned into pre-TB *mālā, a new PPt *māmālāwä could have been coined, and such a proto-form also seems to be reflected in a historical PPt form of our root, viz. the PPt form attested in 159 b 6 that is taken for a nom.sg. *m(a)[m]ā[lo]* in -o from *-au by Hilmarsson, 1991, 29 (there is not much left of the akṣara ⟨lo⟩, but ⟨lau⟩ seems to be excluded, and *o* instead of *au* is indeed already found in documents with MQ character; the evidence from the manuscript would even allow

restoration to *m(a)[m]ā[l](l)o*), and not for a (morphologically extremely awkward) obliquus *m(a)[m]ā[lo](ṣ)* (as was restored by TochSprR(B)). A former Prs I *mälä- seems to be implied by *mlamo* 'hard', see above s.v. *mäl-* 'overflow'; on the other hand, the pre-TB stem *māllā- seems also to be found in a standard TB agent noun *mallāntsa; variants of such a noun are found twice in THT 4062 a 1 and b 2 and have been claimed to denote 'Winzer, Kelterer' < 'Zerdrücker [scil. der Weintrauben]' by Schmidt, 2001d, 20f. (actually in the one instance we have *mall[V]°* and in the other *malla°*, but the latter I think can only be a misspelling for morphologically expected †*mallā°*; note further the writing *-ts-* instead of *-nts-* in the same form *mallatsasmeṃ* in b 2).

~ ᴬ**mäl⁽ᵃ⁾-** 'zusammengepreßt sein', 'being crushed, pressed together'

       (itr) (m/-/-)
       Prs III (m) —;-,-, *mlantär* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *mlamāṃ*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt I in
       PPt *mlo*
       Ipv —

The present stem may be either Class II or III, but with regard to the rest of the paradigm, a Prs III is more likely.

Aɴᴛɪɢʀᴜɴᴅᴠᴇʀʙ/Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'unterdrücken', 'repress' (tr) (m/-/-)

       Prs VIII (m) *mläsmār*,-,-; — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

The paradigms presented here are the ones given by the manuals. In contrast, Adams, 1989a, 11f., and DoT, 456f., argues that all TA forms apart from TA *mläsmār* in A 413 b 2 (*yśalmas mläsmār* "I repress the lust") rather belong to a root *mäl-* 'overflow' together with TB *mlamo* in S 8 (= PK AS 4B) b 1; but for the latter see the discussion above s.v. *mäl-* 'overflow'. As for the TA forms in question, Adams is perfectly right in pointing out that all are used together with TA *oki* 'like, such as', and seem to denote a (positive) emotional expression: A 22 a 6 *täm pälkoräṣ bṛhadyuti mlamānn oki sukyo añumās(k)i (nāṃtsu)* "als Bṛhaddyuti das sah, war er wie erdrückt(?) von Wohlbehagen und verwundert (dachte er bei sich)"; see Sieg, Übers. I, 26; A 398 b 4

(m)l(a)mānn oki wsokoneyo ptāñkät kässinac träṅkäṣ "... out of joy as it were, she says to the Buddha, the teacher"; A 312 b 8 *wsokoneyo ṣeñc mloṣṣ oki ñäktañ* "vor Freude waren die Götter förmlich erdrückt"; see Sieg, Übers. II, 28. A similar passage is, according to K. T. Schmidt (p.c.) attested in A 108 a 4, where instead of TA *täm lo* one should rather read TA *mlo* (a possibility TG, 455 toyed with, but which was abandoned in TG, 444, s.v. *nas-*): *ylāroneyo sāsnotku tāt mlo ṣñ<i>=āriñc.* Schmidt translates: "durch Schwäche ermüdet wärest du erdrückt (durch) dein eigenes Herz" (but see below for *ᴬsnotk?-* 'suffuse'). A completely different sense and phrase is found in A 284 a 3: *(klo)pant lk(ā)tsi • mlanträ wpanträ ////.* Text A 284 is identified as MSN XXV (one of the hell chapters) by Pinault, 1999, 203. Although there is no exact parallel in the Old Turkish version for the passage in line a 3 (cf. Geng/Klimkeit/Laut, 1998, 117f.), this is evidently a description of the infernal torments, so one may translate: " ... to see this sufferings. Being crushed and woven ..." (if TA *wpantär* is indeed a Prs III belonging to *ᴬwāpᵃ-* 'weave', on which see s.v. *ᴬwäpᵃ-* '?').

SEM. Since the (transitive) meaning 'deny' is only attested for TB finite middle forms, it can easily be understood as developed out from a special middle use, such as 'suppress oneself'. In contrast, the TA grundverb is intransitive. The original meaning of the root is most likely 'crush, press together', as still to be seen in TB †*mallāntsa* 'presser' → 'vintager'. ETYM. PIE *√melh₂ 'mahlen' (²LIV, 432f.); for more cognates, see also *mäl-* 'overflow' and *mil-* 'wound, damage'.

mälk⁽ᵃ⁾- '± (an)legen (Schmuck, Waffen)', '± put (on) (jewelry, weapons)'

    (tr) (-/-/m)
    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *malkalñe* Priv —
        Inf *malkatsi*
    Pt I (m) -,-, *mälkāte;-,-, mälkānte*
    PPt *mälkau* (MQ)
    Ipv —

The subjunctive stem seems to have persistent initial accent.

KAUSATIVUM III '± zusammenlegen (Arme)', '± cross (arms)' (tr) (a/-/-)

    Prs IX (a) -,-, *mälkäṣṣäṃ* (MQ); — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —

Ipv —

The restoration to a Prs IX form *(mäl)käṣṣäṃ* in 119 a 2 (MQ) is highly likely. For the meaning, see below.

= *Amälkᵃ-* 'zusammensetzen, -fügen', 'put together' (tr) (-/a/m)

    Prs VII — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *mläṅkmāṃ*
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub V (a) *malkam,-,-;* — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt I (m) —;-,-, *mälkānt*
    PPt *mälko*
    Ipv —

SEM. The meaning of the 3.sg. Pt in H 149.add 12 b 3 is clear: *tsaiñe mälkāte* "put on jewelry" (direct-reflexive middle). More problematic than to be gleaned from the manuals is the 3.pl. Pt in 79, 2: *kertteṃ oṅkor mälkānte*. Sieg, Übers. II, 36, fn. 6 translates "legten sie {= the ministers of king Araṇemi} die Schwerter aneinander"; similarly, Schmidt, 2000, 305: "legten zusammen". The TA parallel of that story does not have a form of this root: A 342 b [= a] 3 *tmäṣ (āmāśa)ñ kälycaṃ kāresyo tānaśolis yokmaṃc ṣtmoräṣ*. Sieg and Schmidt, l.c., translate here: "Darauf sagen (die Minister), mit drohenden (?) Schwertern an der Tür der Dānaśālā stehend". On the unclear hapax TA *kälycaṃ* acting as adnominal of TA *kāresyo* 'with swords', see now Carling, DThTA, s.v. *kälyc** with the proposals 'sheath' (by W. Winter) or 'sleeve' (by G.-J. Pinault). Based on the TA evidence, the translation of the TB passage 79, 2 by Hilmarsson, 1991, 134 (based on a proposal by Thomas, 1957, 92, fn. 1 to translate *oṅkor* with 'Umhüllung, Falte') makes more sense than the ones given above: "'having taken (position), they sheathed [their] swords' (i.e. '... they laid [their] swords in a cover')". Hence, we are dealing here with *mälkᵃ-* 'put (onto)' and an obliquus of direction (on which see most recently Carling, 2000, 6f.). On the other hand, the TB Prs in 119 a 2 refers to the body parts *pokaine* 'arms', so we may be dealing with a meaning like 'put (together)' in the sense of 'cross' (if the form is restored correctly). In TA, the root has the meaning 'put together' either said of concrete things (e.g., 'bones' in A 12 b 1) or of abstract concepts (A 371 a 4). The *m*-Part TA *mläṅkmāṃ* that is now attested twice in the YQ manuscript refers to 'jewelry', but the respective passages cannot simply be translated by 'putting on jewelry', because, interestingly enough, the *m*-Part is in both passages preceded by TA *kälnmāṃ* 'sounding': YQ 2 a 5 *kälnmāṃ mläṅkmāṃ yetwesyo* and YQ 3 a 1 *kälnmāṃ mläṅkmāṃ yetwe(s)*; Ji/Winter/Pinault therefore translate "ornaments (which were) touching each other and making a (pleasant) noise"; see also Pinault, 1990, 190ff., who gives the meaning 'arrangés, combinés'; on the Old Turkish parallel, see now Wilkens, 2008, 417f. ETYM. PIE *√melk 'weave together'; see Adams, DoT, 457.

[ᴬ**mält-** '?', the TA hapax *mältont* in A 152 a 4 may be a PPt from a root *mält-*, but has to remain unclear, because the sentence contains two more hapax legomena.]

mä(s)ʔ- 'gehen', 'go' (itr) (-/-/a)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I + III (a) -, *masta, masa/massa/msā-ne*; —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The root provides the suppletive preterit stem of *i-* 'go', the plural of the suppletive preterit being itself suppleted by *mit⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'set out, go, come'. TEB, 225, § 407, fn. proposes that *maś(c)e(r)* in 108 a 5 may belong to this root, but Schmidt, 1986a, 646f. has shown that the form is an informal-style variant of *yām-* 'do'. Eᴛʏᴍ. Adams, DoT, 60f., following Van Windekens, derives the verb from "an intransitive use of **meu̯s-* 'move, take'", basically followed by ²LIV, 445 s.v. **√meu̯sH* 'aufheben, wegnehmen'; but note that **h₂mu-* (as probably continued by *musk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'disappear') would also result in this form.

ᴬ**mäs-** '?' (?) (m/-/-)

        Prs VIII (m) -,-, *msäṣtär*; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II in
        PPt *mamsu*
        Ipv —

TG, 455 does not give a translation for TA *msäṣträ* in A 167 b 3, because it is attested without much context: //// *koṃ msäṣträ āy* ////. Unfortunately, the two new attestations of the PPt TA *mamsu* in YQ 38 b 4 and YQ 39 b 7 are similarly unclear (for YQ 39 b 7, see also Ji, 1987, 76). Schmidt, 1999b, 284 posits as meaning of the root 'erscheinen', Kausativum 'erscheinen lassen, in Erscheinung bringen, zeigen', but he does not discuss either passage.

mäsk- 'tauschen, (aus)wechseln, ändern', '(ex)change' (tr) (a/-/x)

        Prs IXb (a) -,-, *maskäṣṣäṃ*; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —

          Ger I — Abstr I —

Sub IXb — Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

          Inf *maskässi*

Pt II (x) *myāskawa, myāskasta-ñ, myāska;—* | *myāskamai,-, myāskate;*

          -,-, myāskante

PPt *memisku*| *memiskoṣ*

Ipv IV (m) *maskäṣṣar;-*

The Inf *maskässi* is also attested in THT 1683 a 5; the 3.pl. Pt *myāskante* is found in THT 1345 a 2 and in THT 1537 frg. g a 2 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.).

SEM. For the semantics, cf. Melchert, 1978, 106f. and Hackstein, 1995, 194f. ETYM. Melchert, 1978, 106f. objects to the traditional view that the verb is the kausativum of *mäsk*[ä]- 'be' for semantic reasons. He further does not think that the verb is a cognate of *ᴬmäsk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'change' (thus the meaning given by the manuals; but see s.v.). Melchert rather derives this verb from a PIE present *mi-sk̂e/o- from PIE *√mei̯ 'wechseln; tauschen, ändern' (²LIV, 426; see also Hackstein, 1995, 195ff.). For the *i*-vowel found in the PPt and in the abstract noun *misko* 'exchange', I would rather follow Schulze, 1924, 171f. = 1934, 246 than Hackstein, 1995, 197, fn. 68. Normier, 1980, 258 assumed the verb is a cognate of Gk. ἀμείβω '(ver)tausche' and to be derived from PIE *h₂mig^ʷʰ-sk̂e/o-. Apparently, pre-PT *misk- had turned to PT *mäsk-, which was then taken for the zero grade of a root with full grades PT *m'äsk- and *m(')æsk-; see for a parallel *wätk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'decide, etc.'.

mäsk[ä]- 'werden, sich befinden', 'become, be' (itr) (m+/-/a)

          Prs III (m+) *mäskemar, mäsketar, mäsketär/msketär;*

           mäskemtär,-, mäskentär/mskentär

           Imp *mäskīmar-c,-, mäskītär;-,-, mäskīyentär*

           nt-Part *mäskeñca*

           m-Part *mäskemane*

           Ger I *mäskelle* Abstr I —

Sub V — Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II *maskālläññe* (sic) Priv —

          Inf —

Pt I (a) -,-, *maska;—*

PPt —

Ipv —

The 1.sg.mid. Imp *mäskīmar-c* is attested in PK AS 13F a 2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 1.pl.mid. Prs *mäskemträ* in TX 1 (= THT 1350) b 7 and in TX 2 (= THT 1368) b 3 (see Thomas, 1974, 79 and 85), and also in THT 1550 b 4: //// *wes no skwassoñcä*﹨ *maskemtṛa* "but we are happy".

= *ᴬmäsk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'werden, sich befinden', 'become, be' (itr) (m+/-/a)

          Prs III (m+) *mäskamār, mäskatār/mskatār, mäskatär/mskatär;*

           -,-, mäskantär/mskaṃtär

> Imp —
> nt-Part *mskantāsac*
> m-Part *mäskamāṃ*
> Ger I *mäskal* Abstr I —
> Inf *mäskatsi*
>> Sub — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II —
>> Pt III (a) -,-, *mäskäs;-,-, mäskär*
>> PPt *mamäsku*
>> Ipv —

The 1.sg.mid. is attested in YQ 27 b 8, the 2.sg.mid. Prs variant TA *mskatär* in THT 2070 a 2. The 3.pl. Pt TA *āluṣ mäskär* is also attested in SHT 6, 1536 as a gloss on Skt. *pravāra[yaṃ]ti* (reading according to K. T. Schmidt apud SHT), but I cannot accept Schmidt's translation "sie haben ferngehalten". *ᴬmäsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* is like TB *mäsk*ᵃ*-* otherwise only used intransitively, which is also true for the Pt III in A 379 a 2 (*rṣivadnaṃ mäskäs pättāñkät* "the Buddha was in Rṣivadaṃ"), and in A 239 a 2 ~ A 222 a 4 (*arnaṃ mäskär umparñe* "they were evil in their appearance"), so the BHS form must belong to one of those BHS causative formations that could also be used intransitively as, e.g., *pariṇāmayati* (see s.v. *yu-* 'seek'). SEM. See Batke, 1999, 42ff. According to her, the clear instances of the finite present forms have the meaning 'become', while the meaning 'sich befinden' given by the manuals as translation of the root is only to be found in the imperfect and non-finite forms beyond doubt, and the same seems to be true for the few preterit forms. ETYM. *mṇ-sk̂e/o- from the root PIE *√men 'bleiben, warten' (²LIV, 437); see, e.g., Melchert, 1978, 104. It cannot be connected with IIr. *√maH 'be, become' for phonological reasons; see Cheung, 2007, 257. The manuals analyze *mäsk-* '(ex)change' as kausativum of this root, but Melchert, 1978, 106f. rightly objected to that view (see s.v.). The inflection of the root as Pt III in TA is in my opinion best explained as due to an irregular weakening of *-ā- to -ä-, which had to turn, e.g., a 3.pl. Pt I *mäskār into *mäskär*.

*mätsts*ᵃ*-* '(ver)hungern', 'starve' (itr) (m/m/-)
> Prs III (m) —;-,-, *mätstsentär* Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
>> Sub V (m) -,-, *mätsātär;* — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
>> Inf *mätstsātsi* (MQ)
> Pt I in
> PPt in *mätstsorsa*
> Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. Sub *mätsātär* is attested in the letter PK LC XX, 2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

~ *A*nätsw*⁽ᵃ⁾*- '(ver)hungern', 'starve' (itr) (—)

        Prs III — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *nätswatsi*
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

KAUSATIVUM I 'verhungern lassen', 'let starve' (tr) (-/m/-)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *nätswassi* (sic)
        Sub IX (m) -,-, *nätswāṣtär*;— Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Both attestations of the kausativum are used together with TA *āñcäṃ* 'self': A 394 b 1f. *n͡u̬nak ṣñ<i>=āñcäm risāt nätswassi* "vielmehr gab er sich selbst hin zu verhungern"; see Thomas, 1957, 128f.; A 74 b 4 *nätswāṣtär āñcäm* "wird er von selbst verhungern [wtl. das Selbst verhungern lassen]"; see Schmidt, 1974, 314. ETYM. Evidently a denominative to a noun in pre-PT *-u̯o- or *-u̯ā-; as for a further diachronic analysis, it is tempting to see in the pre-PT noun in *-u̯o- a formation of the type Gk. ἴσος < *u̯id-s-u̯o-, i.e., a *-u̯o- derivative from the allomorph of an *s*-stem that consisted of zero grades only. As for the root involved, *naut⁽ᵃ⁾-/*A*nut⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'disappear, be destroyed' may be a likely candidate, and since the PIE root underlying this Tocharian verbal root seems to have contained a laryngeal (viz. a *h_2), one probably will have to assume in addition that in a proto-form PIE *nuh$_2$t/d^h-s-u̯o- the laryngeal had been deleted by Schindler's *Wetter* rule (see also s.v. *räss^ä̆-* 'tear, pick').

mi- 'verletzen, schädigen', 'hurt, harm' (tr) (x/x/x)

        Prs IXb (x) -,-, *miyäṣṣäṃ/mīyaṣṣäṃ* (MQ);— | -,-, *miyästär*;— Imp —
                nt-Part *miyaṣṣeñca* (sic)
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub IXb (x) — Opt -,-, *mīyäṣṣi*;— | —;-,-, *miyäṣyentär*
                Ger II — Abstr II *miyäṣälñe/miyaṣlñe* (sic) Priv —
                Inf *mīyässi*
        Pt II (x) *myāyawa, myāsta* (sic),-;— | -,-, *myāyate*;—

PPt *memīyu* | *memīyoṣ/memyoṣ*
Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs variant *mīyaṣṣäṃ* is found in THT 1314 a 5 (arch. ductus). The new attestation of a 3.pl. *miyäṣyentrạ* in IOL Toch 407 b 3 is without context (see now Peyrot, 2007, s.v.), but since the small fragment arguably contains Pātayantikādharmā, the form is rather Opt than Imp. Hackstein, 1995, 196, fn. 67 proposes that the enigmatic *memyas* in 28 a 7 may be "Verschreibung für *memyoṣ*", i.e., a PPt from this root, but this would be a quite heavy misspelling involving a wrong sibilant, and not merely the omission of a vowel sign. The manuals analyze the form as 2.pl. Pt hapax of a root *mem-* 'betrügen (?)' (WTG, 269), and a 2.pl. preterit makes sense in the general context of that passage. Adams, 1993b, 35f. and DoT, 460 proposes a "reduplicated preterit" from a root *²mi-* 'befool' which would have the same morphological structure as the TA finite Pt II forms, but as Hackstein, l.c., points out, this would be the only preterit of TB showing reduplication on the surface. To be sure, it is not certain that we are dealing with a verbal form at all.

= *ᴬmi-* 'verletzen, schädigen', 'hurt, harm' (tr) (x/-/-)
        Prs VIII (x) -,-, *miyäṣ,* — | -,-, *miyäṣtär/myiṣtär* (sic); —
                Imp —;-,-, *miṣānt*
                nt-Part *miṣant*
                m-Part *miyäsmāṃ*
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *miyässi*
        Sub IX — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *miyāṣlune*
        Pt II in
        PPt *mamiyu*
        Ipv —

SEM. The middle forms function as passives with the exception of TA *myiṣtär* in A 6 b 3 and in A 21 a 6. ETYM. Adams, DoT, 460 correctly states that the attested forms look like a kausativum to a grundverb *miy⁽ᵃ⁾-*. To be derived from PIE *√meiH* 'gering werden, schwinden' as set up by ²LIV, 427 (without Toch.). The seṭ character of the PIE root is there reconstructed on the sole evidence of the Sanskrit *nā*-present and the Sanskrit zero grade *mī-*, which were, however, not taken to be probative by Klingenschmitt and Eichner (see the ref. apud ²LIV, fn. 2).

mikᵃ?- '(die Augen) schließen', 'shut (the eyes)' (?) (—)
        Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —

Pt I in
PPt *miko ͗ͧ| mikoṣ*
Ipv —

Since PPts in *-au*, *-oṣ* are otherwise only formed from roots with A-character, it is likely that this is an A-root as well. Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from PIE *√meig̑ʰ/g̑ᵘ̯ʰ 'blinzeln, zucken' (²LIV, 427, without Toch.); see Adams, DoT, 460f.

mit⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich aufmachen, gehen, kommen', 'set out, go, come' (itr) (m/-/a)

       Prs III (m) -,-, *mitetär;-,-, mitentär* Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub V — Opt —
           Ger II *mītalye* Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf *mītatsy*
       Pt III (a) —; *maitam, maitas, maitar/metär* (sic)/*maitare*
       Pt VI (a) —;-,-, *maitem*
       PPt —
       Ipv —

The evident Prs III form *mitetär* is now attested in THT 1262 frg. a b 2. The 3.pl. *mitentär* can also be found in the small fragment THT 1187 b 2. TEB II, 221 lists an Abstr *mītalñe*, which may refer to WTG, 268 where the Ger II *mītalyene* is said to be found "für Abstr. *mītalñe*" in S 5 (= PK AS 5B) b 4 (reedited by Thomas, 1966a, 173, who does not comment on this form), but Thomas, 1952, 59 reckoned with the possibility of a substantivized Ger II as well. The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. The glossary of TochSprR(B), 151 lists a subjunctive form *maitam* that I cannot find in the yet published texts, and which — if it exists — would attest to an ablauting paradigm. The 3.pl. Pt variant *metär* (sic) is attested in the graffito G-Su 4 (Pinault, 1987, 139), and the 2.pl. Pt *maitas* in PK AS 15C a 7 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The 3.pl. variant *maitare* has a secondary final *-e*; see Schmidt, 1986a, 647 and chap. Pt III 9.1.2.2. The plural of the preterit stem provides the suppletive plural for the preterit from *mä(s)ʔ-* 'go'. Enigmatic *maitem* in 484, 5 (MQ) is analyzed as a possible nominal form by WTG, 268; differently, Adams, DoT, 461 takes it to be a Prs I/II of this root. Text 484 is a monastery record, and the passage in question contains a familiar date formula: *piś meñantsene maitem kalā* //// "on the fifth (day) of the month ..." (cf. Carling, 2000, 275). Since we are dealing with a monastery record, *maitem* — if it is a verbal form — should rather be a preterit rather than a present or subjunctive. It is conceivable that a 3.pl. Pt *maitem* 'they went' was created in analogy to the 3.pl. Pt *kamem* 'they came'; as for the semantics, note that the 3.pl. Pt *maitare* in 108 a 3 has indeed end-terminative meaning, i.e., is synonymous with *kamem* (see the translation of the passage by Carling, 2000, 89: "als sie an die Stelle, an der sie sein sollten, kamen [wtl.

gingen]'"). Finally, a form of this root may also lie behind *lau (m)ita* 'away ...'
in PK Cp 32, 6 (cf. Pinault, 1984a, 26).

KAUSATIVUM I 'gehen lassen', 'let go' (tr) (-/a/-)

       Prs IXb — Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I *mitṣle* (sic) Abstr I —
       Sub IXb (a) -, *mītäs-me* (sic),-; — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
             Inf —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

The 2.sg. Sub *mītäs-[me]* in H 150.122 b 4 shows informal simplification of a
consonant cluster; see Schmidt, 1986a, 645; the form is certainly a subjunctive
since it is parallel to the Sub *kāskat* 'you will scatter'; see Broomhead I, 156.

= ᴬ*mitꜱ-* 'sich aufmachen', 'set out' (itr) (-/-/a)

       Prs — Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —
             Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt III (a) -,-, *metäs*;-,-, *metär*
       PPt —
       Ipv —

In spite of the objection by Couvreur, 1954, 261, TA *metär* in A 320 a 1 is
arguably a preterit, which is the analysis by TG, 456; cf. also the translation by
Sieg, Übers. II, 31.

ETYM. Hackstein, 1995, 27f. derives the root from PIE $*\sqrt{(s)}$meith₂ 'gehen
lassen, schicken' (²LIV, 430 sets up $*\sqrt{}$meith₂ 'wechseln, austauschen,
entfernen'). Pt III beside Sub V and Prs III is very remarkable, because these
two stems are usually paired with Pt I (3.pl. Pt *maitare* is not a reflex of an Pt
I, but a secondary form; see above). One may assume that the active aorist
made from the underlying PIE seṭ root originally had intransitive valency,
that the (itr) Sub V was based on such an active aorist PIE $*$meith₂-t > PT
$*$m'äytā-, and the (itr) Pt III derived from a respective (itr) active perfect PIE
$*$me-moith₂-e (with the root-final laryngeal resulting in zero by sound law);
see chap. Pt I 7.3.3., fn. 37.

mil- 'verletzen, beschädigen', 'hurt, wound, damage' (tr) (a/-/-)

       Prs VIII (a) -,-, *milṣäṃ*; — Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —

Sub — Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
      Inf —
Pt III in
PPt *memīloṣepi*
Ipv —

Adams, 1989a, 13f. and DoT, 462 proposes to analyze the Ger *mälṣälle* attested without context in 341 a 1 (MQ) (not in WTG) as a form of this root showing a more archaic root vocalism (the text has indeed some traces of late archaic ductus). According to Watkins, 1969, 75 and Adams, DoT, 462, the Prs VIII goes back to a present stem "PIE **mel-se/o-*" claimed to be also reflected by the Old Irish noun *mell* 'harm, destruction' from *melso-, and which Adams wants to be derived from the same root that also underlies *mäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'crush' and *mely-* 'crush'. However, these two Tocharian roots clearly derive from a PIE seṭ root *√melh₂, and the abstract *mīlar* 'oppression' also is best derived from an *e*-grade variant of that same root, with *-a-* going back to the root-final *-h₂-. As stated above s.v. *mäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'crush', I think that verbal *mil-* spread from (forms like) the PPt that in my view originally belonged to a Pt I PT **m'ælā-* from *mäl⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'crush'; as for *mälṣ-*, this may, of course, go back to *mḷh₂-s- in the same way as the cognate old Prs I stem PT *mälä- reflected by *mlamo* 'hard' (see above s.v. *mäl-* 'overflow') may go back to *mḷh₂-.

miw⁽ᵃ⁾- 'zittern, beben', 'tremble, quake' (itr) (x/-/x)
      Prs I (a) -,-, *miwäṃ*; — Imp -,-, *mīwi*; —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part *miwamane*
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Prs XII (m) -,-, *miwäntär* (MQ); — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub V — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II *maiwalñe* Priv —
          Inf *maiwatsi*
      Pt I (x) -,-, *maiwa*; — | -,-, *maiwāte*; —
      PPt in *mamaiwarsa*
      Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. *m(i)wänträ* has to be restored in PK AS 12J b 1; see Couvreur, 1954, 91; Thomas, 1979b, 8. The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. *mamaiwarsa* is attested in 338 b 2; cf. also Adams, DoT, 463.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'schütteln', 'shake' (tr) (—)
      Prs IXb — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part *mīwäskemane*
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —

                    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                    Inf —

      Pt —

      PPt —

      Ipv —

= *ᴬmiw^ᴮ-* 'beben', 'shake, quake' (itr) (a/-/-)

      Prs I+II (a) -,-, *meṣ;-,-, meyeñc* Imp -,-, *meyā;* —

              nt-Part —

              m-Part —

              Ger I — Abstr I —

              Inf —

      Sub V — Opt —

              Ger II — Abstr II *mewlune*

      Pt —

      PPt —

      Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. The active forms have as subjects nouns denoting shaking natural objects, whereas the TB middle are found together with *pit* 'bile' and a genitive, as e.g., in 85 b 4f.: *araṇemiñ lānte pit maiwāte-ne* "bebte dem König Araṇemi seine Galle", which is tantamount to "King Araṇemi fainted"; see Schmidt, 1974, 120ff. Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from the root set up as PIE *√mi̯eu̯h₁ '(sich) bewegen' by ²LIV, 445 with ref. (according to Hackstein, 1995, 25 and 191, *√mi̯eh₁u̯ had been the most original shape of the root). At least Vedic *mīvati* 'move (tr), push' and Iranian *mīu̯a-* 'remove' indeed seem to belong with the Tocharian root; as for the other forms subsumed under *√mi̯eu̯h₁ by ²LIV, most of them were claimed by Puhvel, 2004, 105 to belong with yet another PIE root denoting 'totter, be about to fall, start to sink'; since according to Puhvel Gk. ἀμύω 'fall' is also to be included there, this other root should best be set up as PIE *√h₂meu̯. As for the TA present stem forms, they go back to a root allomorph with an ablaut grade different from that met in TB *miw-* from PIE *miHu̯-, viz. PT *m(')æyw-. The strange absence of surfacing -w- in the TA present has a parallel in the TA PPt *pāpeyu* from *ᴬpiw^ᴮ-* 'blow'; probably pre-TA *-ywC- resulting from syncopated *-ywäC- was turned into *-yyC- (somewhat differently Adams, DoT, 463). The stem PT *māywā- constantly found in the Sub and Pt forms may have started out as a preterit formation in PT *-ā- based on that same present stem PT *m(')æyw-.

ᴬmuk^{ᴮ?}- 'desist' → *mauk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'id.'

mutk^{ᴮ?}- 'ausgießen', 'pour (out)' (tr) (-/-/a)

      Prs — Imp —

              nt-Part —

              m-Part —

              Ger I — Abstr I —

      Sub — Opt —

        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

        Inf —

Pt I (a) —;-,-, *mutkāre-ne*

PPt —

Ipv —

Hapax in 107 a 3f. Schmidt, 1999a, 95ff.; 2008a, 331 objects to the traditional translation 'verstärken' and translates the form with 'ausgießen' on account of a Sanskrit parallel version. In addition, Schmidt argues that *mutkāttseś* in line a 4 is not an allative of an Inf of this root — as is the traditional view — but has to be read *mutkāntseś* and is a noun indicating a certain unit of measurement (see also Pinault, 2008, 113f.). Finally, Schmidt shows that *mūtkäm* in PK AS 12H b 6 and *mutkuweṣ* in PK AS 17J b 1, which also have been said to belong to this root by the manuals, are to be read *pūtkäm* and *putkuweṣ*, respectively (see s.v. *putk-* 'shut').

mus⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich erheben, hochgezogen sein', 'rise, be pulled up' (itr/pass) (m/-/-)

        Prs VI (m) -,-, *musnātär* (MQ);-,-, *musnāntär* Imp —

             nt-Part —

             m-Part —

             Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub — Opt —

             Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

             Inf —

        Pt I in

        PPt *musau*

        Ipv —

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'aufheben', 'lift, give up' (tr) (—)

        Prs — Imp —

             nt-Part —

             m-Part —

             Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub II — Opt —

             Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

             Inf *muṣsi*

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

The Inf *muṣsi* is analyzed as a grundverb form by the manuals, but Krause (WTG 126, § 122, fn. 4) rightly pointed out that one would rather expect a Sub V to be paired with a Prs VI and a Pt I. Actually, both attestations of the Inf *muṣsi* do have transitive meaning (see below), while the Prs VI forms can be interpreted as intransitives: 119 a 2 *(ṣañ ke)ktseñ tusa rsaṃ musnāträ (mäl)käṣṣäṃ pokaine* was rendered as "daher reckt er (seinen) Körper, hebt [seine] Arme auf [und] legt [sie] zusammen" by Schmidt, 1974, 327; however, we cannot exclude that *musnāträ* is not constructed with *pokaine*: "stretches his body, rises, [and] crosses his arms". The same kind of ambiguity is met in

H 149.14 a 5: *(ṣememṭs ye)kt=āñm satāṣlñe kauc ka ṣ āṃtsne musnānträ* "(Bei einigen) [ist] das Ausatmen [ganz] schwach [wtl. von schwachem Selbst], und [ihre] Schultern heben sich nur eben empor [bzw. sie heben ihre Schultern nur eben empor]" (restoration and translation according to Schmidt, 1974, 295 contra Broomhead I, 143) — actually, the dual *āṃtsne* can be either subject or object. The two attestations of the TB infinitive, on the other hand, rather have the transitive meaning 'lift, give up': S 3 (= St. Ch. 00316.b) a 1f. *priyavārgsa larauñe śaul kekts(e)nn(e se) ñke ra cämpim muss[i]* "durch den Priyavarga möchte ich die Liebe (zu) Leben [und] Körper noch heute aufheben können" (see Thomas, 1966, 166 with fn. 5, and Pinault, 1990a, 63). As for H 149.301 a 2 *////campya muṣṣi lakle kwri •*, Broomhead I, 218 translates "if he were able to raise the suffering" (I would prefer "lift the sufferings"). The passive meaning 'be pulled up' (said of a garment) is attested in the PPt *musau* in 322 a 1f. and a 2f., and this instance of a passive meaning seems to suggest that even in case the middle forms were indeed confined to intransitive semantics, there must existed at least active forms in the grundverb paradigm which had the transitive meaning 'raise, pull up'.

= *Amusᴮ-* 'sich heben', 'rise' (itr) (m/-/m)

        Prs VI (m) -,-, *musnātär;* — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I *musnāl* Abstr I —
            Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I (m) -,-, *musāt;* —
        PPt *muso*
        Ipv —

The Ger I TA *musnāl* is attested in PK NS 2 b (?) 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; also listed by Couvreur, 1956, 98 without ref.). Whereas TA *musnātär* in A 6 a 1 may be interpreted as a passive ("the jewelry was raised (by her breast)" — but see Sieg, Übers. I, 9, who translates intransitively), TA *musāt* in A 23 b 3 is certainly intransitive: *tmäk proṣluneyo ṣkārā musāt ākärnunt aśänyo ptāñkät käṣyā(p) kapśaññac lkāmāṃ pälsk[ā]t* "sofort wich er [wtl. hob er] sich mit Scheu zurück, [und], mit tränenden Augen auf den Körper des Buddha, des Meisters, blickend, dachte er" (Schmidt, 1974, 295 following Sieg, Übers. I, 27). Eᴛʏᴍ. PIE *√meu̯sH 'aufheben, wegnehmen' (²LIV, 445); see Adams, DoT, 466.

musk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'verloren gehen, verschwinden', 'disappear, perish' (itr) (m/-/a)

        Prs III (m) -,-, *musketär;*-,-, *muskentär* Imp —;-,-, *muskīntär*
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *muskemane*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II *muskālñe* Priv —

Inf *muskātsi*

Pt I (a) -,-, *muska*; —
PPt *muskau*
Ipv —

The Imp *muskī(ntär)* can be restored in PK AS 16.2. a 4 (see Pinault, 1989a, 155), the *m*-Part *muskemane* is attested in PK NS 55 b 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

ANTIGRUNDVERB + KAUSATIVUM II 'schwinden lassen', 'make subside'

(tr) (a/-/-)
Prs IXb (a) -,-, *muskaṣṣäṃ*; — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub II — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II *muṣṣalyñe* Priv —
    Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The Abstr *muṣṣalyñe* is attested in PK AS 6E a 2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the Prs *muskaṣṣäṃ* in W 4 a 5; for the analysis as Prs IXb, see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.4.2.

= ᴬ**musk̓-** 'verloren gehen, verschwinden', 'disappear, perish' (itr) (-/-/m)

Prs — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
    Inf —
Sub V — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II *muskālune*
Pt I (m) -,-, *muskāt*; —
PPt —
Ipv —

ETYM. According to Hackstein, 1995, 191f., from *m(i̯)uh₁-sk̂e/o- from PIE *√mi̯eh₁u̯ 'fortbewegen; sich fortbewegen' (²LIV, 445f. *√mi̯eu̯h₁). Note, however, that Gk. ἀμύω 'fall' and Hittite *mau(s)-* 'fall', which seem quite close to the Tocharian root with respect to semantics, may belong to yet another root, as per Puhvel, 2004, 105.

ᴬ**me-** 'gage' → *mai-* 'id.'

ᴬ**met-** 'set out' → ᴬ*mit?-* 'id.'

mem- 'deceive' → *mi-* 'hurt, harm'

mely- '(zer)drücken', 'crush, squeeze' (tr) (x/-/-)

        Prs II (x) -,-, *melyiṃ/melyan-ne*;-,-, *melyeṃ* | -,-, *melyätär* (MQ); —

             Imp —

             nt-Part —

             m-Part —

             Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub II — Opt —

             Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

             Inf *melyatsi*

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

melyätra (not in WTG) found in 135 a 5 (MQ) is most likely a 3.sg.mid. Prs (or Sub) of this root: *sū melyäträ* • "he crushes/is crushed". The Inf *melyatsi* is attested in PK NS 406 a 5 (a photograph of this text is published on the front cover of LALIES 7). Note that both 3.sg. *melyäträ* and Inf *melyatsi* descriptively show lack of syncope of the thematic vowel *ä, but *ä must have replaced here more archaic *'æ from *-eie-; see below.

= ^A**malyw-** '(zer)drücken', 'crush, squeeze' (tr) (a+/-/-)

        Prs II (a+) -, *malywät*,-; — Imp -,-, *malywā*; —

             nt-Part *malywäntāṃ*

             m-Part *malywmāṃ*

             Ger I — Abstr I —

             Inf —

        Sub — Opt —

             Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

Eᴛʏᴍ. We are dealing with a PIE causative-iterative present *molh₂uéie/o- from PIE *√melh₂ 'grind' (*moluéie/o- > *mælw'æ-/mælw'äiæ-; Germanic also preserves an iterative *molh₂uéie/o-); see Klingenschmitt, 1982, 146, fn. 6, 235; Hackstein, 1995, 26; Kim, 2001a, 53f.; 2007a, 53f. ²LIV, 433 sets up a root *√melh₂u 'zerreiben, mahlen' already for PIE. Adams, 1988a, 73 incorrectly posited a *ie/o-present *molu-ie/o- (but cf. "molw-(e)ye/o-" in DoT, 470); similarly Rasmussen, 2006, 59 with fn. 2.

mai- '± abschätzen, ermessen', '± gage, gauge, estimate' (tr) (m/-/-)

        Prs IXa (m) -,-, *maistär*; — Imp -,-, *maiṣṣitär*; —

             nt-Part —

             m-Part —

             Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub IXa — Opt —

             Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

             Inf *maistsi*

        Pt —

PPt —

Ipv —

WTG, 269 sets up two different roots: (1) *mai-* 'messen' said to be the equivalent of *ᴬme-*, and to be attested only by the noun *maim* 'Maß', and (2) *mais-* 'überragen' (with question mark) on the evidence of the Inf *maistsi* in 273 a 2. Differently, Schmidt, 1974, 504 proposes to set up one single root *mai-* = *ᴬme-* from which he also derives *maistär* in 355 b 3 and *maiṣṣiträ* in H add.149 83 b 5. A possible fourth attestation — the 2.sg. Pt *maista* — is gained by Schmidt, 2000, 229 thanks to a new reading of 622 a 4: *////–[v]aśīr maista ce preke*. Unfortunately, all four attestations are not very clear with respect to semantics. *maistär* can be either Prs or Sub, it governs the object *tsäṅkarwa* 'mountain tops'; the context of *maiṣṣitär* is quite unclear as well: *//// [k]ām[ñ]äkte maiṣṣiṯṟa ṯaṅkwaṣṣe* "the god of love ... pertaining to love"; for 273 a 2 *//// maistsi rām no päknāskenträ* Krause, WTG, 121, § 120, fn. 4 proposes a translation "[s]ie gedenken gleichsam zu übertreffen (??)", a similar meaning is set up by Schmidt, 2000, 231 for *maista* in 622 a 4: "du hast übertroffen (?)". Adams, DoT, 473 rather follows the analysis given by WTG for the Inf *maistsi* claiming a possible connection with TA *messi*, but he does not discuss the other forms. To be sure, TA *messi* 'gage' would be the perfect match for that TB stem, and a similar meaning for the TB forms is not excluded, so I accept the connection of these forms. As for the Prs/Sub stem, we are certainly dealing with an *sk*-stem formation *mæyäskä/æ- with early loss of *ä triggered by the preceding *i̯, i.e., of the same type to be seen with *aisk-*; see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.6.2.1.

= *ᴬme-* 'ermessen', 'gage' (?) (—)

   Prs VIII — Imp —

     nt-Part —

     m-Part —

     Ger I — Abstr I —

     Inf *messi*

   Sub — Opt —

     Ger II — Abstr II —

   Pt —

   PPt —

   Ipv —

SEM. The TA Inf is a hapax in A 253 a 1 in a rather fragmentary context, but its meaning is nevertheless assured by an Old Turkish parallel version, which was already identified by Müller/Sieg, 1916, 405, who give the following translation of the respective Old Turkish passage: "Den auf dieser braunen Erde befindlichen Staub nach einzelnen Körnchen zu zählen, nicht [aber] jenes Weisheit [nach] und Begriff zu erfassen ... [ist möglich]" (cf. also Tekin, 1980, 112; the Hami version does not provide a similar parallel at present time, cf. Pinault, 1999, 199); the TA passage A 253 a 1 *//// tsāṃ tkaṃ messi • caṣi knānmuneyis mem pärtsi* is translated by Müller/Sieg: "... Erde zu zählen; von jenes Weisheit das Maß zu erfassen". ETYM. It is traditionally taken for granted that the root *mai-/ᴬme-* is to be connected with the nouns *maim*/TA

mem. In TB this noun has the meaning '(manner of) thinking, sense, cleverness' (cf. TEB II, 223); on the other hand, TA *mem* is rather synonymous with TA *yärm* 'measure, gage, amount' (e.g., in the phrase TA *lyutār memaṣ* 'beyond all measure'; a meaning 'sense, cleverness' can, of course, easily be derived from a basic meaning 'measure, measure of thinking'). In order to connect all of these forms, one can set up a PT root *m(')æy- 'measure, gage'. The PIE root involved then may have been either *√meh₁ 'messen' (²LIV, 424, with fn. 1, where the connection of TB *maistär* is doubted) or *√med 'messen, für Einhaltung sorgen, sich kümmern' (²LIV, 423, without Toch.), as proposed by Winter, 1962a, 33 = 1984, 275 = 2005, 63, PT *m(')æy- going back either to *meh₁-i̯- or to *mē/od-i̯-.

mauk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich fernhalten von, ablassen von', 'refrain from, desist' (itr) (-/a/x)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V (a) -,-, *maukaṃ*; — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *maukalñe* Priv *amaukacci*
        Inf —
    Pt I (x) -, *maukāsta, mauka*;-,-, *maukāre* | -, *maukatai* (MQ),-; —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

The 3.sg. *mauka* in 591 b 6 has to be emended to Sub *mauka<ṃ>*, as per TochSprR(B), s.v., fn. 7 (a 3.sg. Pt *mauka* is attested beyond doubt in 266 b 3). The Abstr *mauka[l]ñ(e)* is found in THT 1270 b 1 without context (the small piece seems to have MQ character); the Priv has the meaning 'unablässig', 'unceasing' (see Hilmarsson, 1991, 31).

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I '?' (tr) (m/-/-)

    Prs IXb (m) -, *maukästār* (MQ),-; — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

A 2.sg. Prs (or Sub) *maukästār* is attested in the unpublished text PK AS 12A (MQ) a 3 (also listed in WTG, 270), according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.

~ ᴬ*muk⁽ᵃ⁾⁻* 'nachlassen, ablassen', 'desist' (itr) (-/-/a)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —

             Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt I (a) -, *mukāṣt*,-; —
      PPt —
      Ipv —

Hapax in A 303 a 3: *mā śkaṃ mukāṣt mā siṃsāte* //// "and you (sg.) did not desist nor were you satiated ...".

ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√meṷk 'losbinden, abstreifen' (²LIV, 443f. without Toch.); see Adams, DoT, 476 with ref.

ᴬmrosk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'feel disgust' → *mrausk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'id.'

mrausk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'Überdruß, Ekel empfinden, der Welt entsagen', 'feel disgust,
      an aversion to the world' (itr) (m/m/m)
      Prs VI (m) -,-, *mrausknātär* (MQ);-,-, *mrauskantär* (sic) Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub V (m) -,-, *mrauskātär*;-,-, *mrauskāntär* Opt —
             Ger II *mrauskalye* Abstr II *mrauskalñe* Priv —
             Inf *mrauskatsi* (tr) (Š)
      Pt I (m) *mrauskāmai*,-, *mrauskāte*;-,-, *mrauskānte*
      PPt *mamrauskau | mamrauskaṣ*
      Ipv —

mrausknā //// in 394 b 4 is restored to *mrausknātär* in TochSprR(B), s.v.; the emendation of *mrauskanträ* in K 3 a 5 (on the text see now Pinault, 2007, 210) to a 3.pl. Prs *mrausknanträ* by Sieg, 1938, 11 is very plausible; the 3.pl. Sub *mrauskānträ* is attested in PK AS 15J b 6 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), and an MQ form *mrauskantṛa* also in THT 1859 b [recte a] 2. An intransitive 3.sg. *mrauskatär* is found in THT 1172 a 3: *teki ktsaitsñ(e) srūkalñes=empelye mrauskatṛa* "due to illness, old age, [and] death, one would feel a terrible aversion to the world" (the passage is also cited by Thomas, 1991, 19f. without ref.; the text has no site mark signature, but apparently MQ character). On the accent of the Sub V and the transitive Inf *mrauskatsi* in 5 a 7 (Š), see the discussion in chap. Sub I/V 18.3.2.

KAUSATIVUM I '(der Welt) überdrüssig machen', 'make someone feel
      disgust, an aversion to the world' (tr) (m/-/-)
      Prs IXb (m+) -,-, *mrauskästär*;— Imp -, *mrauskäṣṣitar*,-; —
             nt-Part *mrauskäṣṣeñca*
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
             Inf —
      Pt —

PPt —

Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. Prs *mrauskästär* is attested in PK NS 54 b 5: *l̥aklentaṣ[ṣ]eṃ klautkeṃtsa ṣañ añm no sū mrauṣ̄kastr̥a* (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.) "due to the (different) ways of suffering, he makes himself feel an aversion to the world". The 3.sg.mid. Imp *mrauskäṣṣitär* in TEB I, 219, § 394,4 and the 3.sg.act. Prs *mrauskäṣṣäṃ* in TEB I, 213, § 382 are most likely only reconstructed on the basis of the attested forms.

= ᴬ*mrosk⁽ä⁾*- 'Überdruß, Ekel empfinden, der Welt entsagen', 'feel disgust, an
        aversion to the world' (itr) (m/-/m)
        Prs VII (m) -,-, *mrosänkātär,—* Imp —;-,-, *mrosäṃśänt*
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *mrosänkātsi*
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *mrosklune*
        Pt I (m) -,-, *mroskat;-,-, mroskant*
        PPt *māmrosku*
        Ipv I (m) *pämroskār;-*

TA *mämroskār* in A 301 b 8 has — no doubt correctly — been emended to TA *pämroskār* by TG, 457.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I '(der Welt) überdrüssig machen', 'make someone feel disgust,
        an aversion to the world' (tr) (—)
        Prs VIII — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *mroskäsmāṃ*
                Ger I *mroskäṣlis* Abstr I —
                Inf *mroskässi*
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Since TB has a Kausativum I paradigm, it is likely that the TA Prs VIII also goes back to an *sk*-present, i.e., constitutes a kausativum and not an antigrundverb stem.

Sᴇᴍ. The root is often the equivalent of Skt. *nir* √vid 'feel an aversion to the world'. In Tocharian, the grundverb is construed with the perlative; see Thomas, 1991, 20, fn. 64 and Carling, 2000, 16. Eᴛʏᴍ. Hilmarsson, 1988, 46f., fn. 5 derives the root from a *-sk̂e/o- present of PIE *√mreu̯H or *√mreHu̯, a root continued in the Av. passive aorist *mraoī* 'was maltreated' (not in ²LIV). But the full vowel of the root speaks against the derivation from a pre-PT *sk*-present. It is more likely that we are dealing with a denominative derived from an unattested *mrǣwskǣ 'aversion'.

mlut^{ä}- '± herausziehen, rupfen', '± pull out, pluck' (?) (—)

        Prs IXa — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *mlutāṣällona* Abstr I —
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II *mlutālle* Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

SEM. WTG, 270 proposes a translation "'anschwellen' (?), 'ziehen' (?)". The root is only attested in the medical Weber manuscript. The Ger I *mlutāṣällona* in Fill. W 32 b 3 refers to 'feathers'; see Sieg, 1955, 76: "Federn ... sind herauszuziehen (?)". All three instances of the Ger II are unclear: Fill. W 3 a 4 *pä[rṣereṃ] nakṣäṃ mlutālle sākäṣṣäṃ* "[das] vernichtet die Kopfschmerzen (?) (*pärsareṃ*, so zu verb{essern}), aber das Ziehen (?) (*mlutālle*) läßt es übrig"; see Sieg, 1955, 72; similarly, Fill. W 42 b 2 *mlutālle sākäṣṣäṃ pärsareṃ nakṣäṃ.* The interpretation of these passages depends on that of the otherwise unattested *pärsare*, for which Sieg, l.c., proposed a meaning 'headache', and he is followed, most recently, by Winter, 2001, 135 = 2005, 524 ad 375. Differently, Adams, DoT, 479: "it surpasses plucking [of the hair], it destroys lice [?]". ETYM. Since the meaning is quite unclear, the proposed etymologies (on which see Adams, DoT, 479) are uncertain.

mlutk^{ä}- 'loskommen, davonkommen', 'escape' (itr) (m/m/-)

        Prs III (m) -,-, *mlutketär*,— Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V (m) *mlutkāmar*,-,-;— Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *mlutketä[r]* is attested in G-Qa 5 b (see Pinault, 1987, 168). The manuals (e.g., WTG, 270) analyze *mlutku* in W 38 b 4 and *mlucku* in W 7 a 6 as PPts from this root, but this is very unlikely, because both forms are adnominals of *kuñcit* 'sesame', cf. Sieg, 1955, 72f.: "Falls zu der Wz. *mlutk* gehörig, könnte mit *mlucku kuñcit* "zerstampfter (?) Sesam" gemeint sein" (ad W 7 a 6); "Für *[mlutku] kuñcit* (38 b 4) muß wohl *[mlucku] kuñcit* "zerstampfter (?) Sesam" gelesen werden" (p. 77). Consequently, Adams, DoT, 479 sets up a separate root *²mlutk-* 'crush' for these PPt forms.

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'lösen, losmachen', 'take off' (tr) (-/-/a)

>   Prs — Imp —
>   nt-Part —
>   m-Part —
>   Ger I — Abstr I —
>   Sub — Opt —
>   Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
>   Inf —
>   Pt III (a) -,-, *mlautkasa*; —
>   PPt —
>   Ipv —

3.sg. Pt III *mlautkasa* is attested in PK NS 44 b 4 referring to the taking off of a piece of jewelry: *(pañ)äkte lkātsi toṃ tsaiññenta mlautkasa mañiyantse wa(sa)* "in order to see the Buddha-lord, she took off these ornaments [and] ga(ve) [them] to a female servant" (unpublished, G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

~ ᴬ*mluskᵃ-* 'loskommen, davonkommen', 'escape' (itr) (m/a/-)

>   Prs III (m) -,-, *mloskatär*; — Imp —
>   nt-Part —
>   m-Part —
>   Ger I — Abstr I —
>   Inf —
>   Sub V (a) *mloskam*,-,-; — Opt —; -,-, *mluskiñc*
>   Ger II — Abstr II —
>   Pt I in
>   PPt *mlusko*
>   Ipv —

TA *mloskaträ* in A 376 a 3 is almost without context, but since it is construed with an ablative just like the certain 1.sg. Sub in A 120 a 5, it is likely that it belongs to the same root. The damaged word form TA *mlus(·)ā* //// in A 194 b 1 can be restored to either TA *mlus(k)ā(t)* or to TA *mlus(k)ā(lune)*, according to TG, 457; note that affiliation of ablauting Sub V stems with Prs III/IV is unusual. The PPt TA *mluskos* is attested in THT 1492 a 2. ETYM. Schneider, 1941, 50 and Melchert, 1978, 121f. proposed a connection with Gk. βλώσκω 'go, come' from PIE *√melh₃ 'hervorkommen' (²LIV, 433f. without Toch.). We are in any case dealing with an *sk*-stem made from a root without dental in TA, but from a root with dental extension in TB, as per Melchert, l.c.: *mlu-sk̂e/o- > TA *mlusk-*, *mlu-T-sk̂e/o- > TB *mlutk-*; I cannot follow Hartmann, 2001, 113, fn. 76.

ᴬ*mluskᵃ-* 'escape' → *mlutkᵃ-* 'id.'

ᴬ*mlok-* '?' (?) (a/-/-)

>   Prs I (a) —;-,-, *mlokiñc* Imp —
>   nt-Part —
>   m-Part —
>   Ger I — Abstr I —

                    Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Hapax in A 166 a 4: • *kāts kärk nīmäṃ mlokīñcäṃ esnaṃ prā ////*. The passage remains totally unclear, because both TA *kärk* and TA *nīmäṃ* are hapax legomena as well; however, one may guess they also refer to body parts like TA *kāts* 'belly' and TA *esnaṃ* 'shoulders' do.

Y

ᴬy ᵃ- 'go, travel' → *iy ᵃ-* 'id.'

ᴬya(p)- 'machen', 'do' (tr) (x/-/-)
        Prs II (x) *ypam, yat, yaṣ; ypamäs, yac, ypeñc* |
                    ypamār, yatār, yatär; ypamtär,-, ypantär
                    Imp -,-, *ypä;-,-, ypār* | -,-, *ypāt;* -,-, *ypānt*
                    nt-Part *ypant*
                    m-Part *ypamāṃ*
                    Ger I *yal* Abstr I —
                    Inf *yatsi*
        Sub — Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The second attestation of TA *ypamträ* is found in THT 1377 frg. e a 3. According to Pinault, 1997, 125 and 132 (pace TG, 457), instead of a 1.pl. Imp from this root, one should rather restore to TA *(ritā)mät* in A 270 a 5 and to a Sub TA *(yā)mät* in A 270 b 4, so there is no attestation of a 1.pl. Ipv TA **ypāmät* attested at all. TA *ya(p)-* provides the suppletive present stem of TA *yām-* 'machen'. Eᴛʏᴍ. As already recognized by various scholars, the stem variant *y(ä)p-* shows up whenever the thematic vowel ought to have been pre-PT **o*, and *ya-* whenever one expects pre-PT **e*. Pinault, 1989, 113 derives the root from a cognate of Av. *yav-* etc., whereas Peters, 2004, 434 opts for pre-PT **i̯eme/o-*; Klingenschmitt, 1994, 314 = 2005, 356, fn. 6 was the first to suggest derivation from PIE **h₁ei̯e/o-*. For the phonological details to be presupposed, see Peters, 2004, 429ff. According to this author, in this way the TA present can be derived from the same root as the TB equivalent, which is *yamaskau, yamaṣṣäṃ*, etc. from *yām-* 'do'.

yāṅk⁽ä⁾- 'verwirrt, betört sein', 'be deluded' (itr) (-/a/a)

        Prs IV — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *yoṅkomane*
                Ger I *yoṅkolle* Abstr I —
        Sub V (a) -,-, *yāṅkaṃ*; — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I (a) -,-, *yāṅka*; —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

A 3.sg. Pt *yāṅka* is listed in TEB II, 225, and such a form may be attested in the small fragment THT 1299 a 2: //// *m y[ā]ṅka wrotsai wertsai* "... was deluded; the great gathering ...". Ger I *[yo]ṅkolle* is found in H 149.321 b 2 (Broomhead I, 320).

KAUSATIVUM I 'betören, verzaubern', 'bewitch' (tr) (a/-/-)

        Prs IXb (a) *yāṅkäskau* (MQ),-,-; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub IXb — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *yāṅkässi* (S)
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

WTG, 270 lists an *m*-Part *yäṅkaskemane* of the Prs IXb stem in PK AS 12D a 2 with the remark "sic", which has to be an emendation of what must have been read *yänkaskemane* and still has a wrong root vocalism; since a nasal before *k* is to my knowledge always rendered by ⟨ṅ⟩ (except in the special cases of *klyeñktra* in 255 a 5 and *klyentra* in 254 a 3 from *klänk-* 'doubt'; see s.v.), it is with reason that Couvreur, 1954, 84 proposed to read rather *yätkaskemane* from an (otherwise unattested) root *yätk^{ä?}-* (confirmed by G.-J. Pinault, p.c.); see s.v. *yätk^{ä?}-* '?'.

= ^A*yāṅk⁽ä⁾-* 'verwirrt, betört sein', 'be deluded' (?) (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *yāṅklune*
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

KAUSATIVUM I 'betören, verzaubern', 'bewitch' (tr) (a/-/-)

Prs VIII (a) — Imp -,-, *yāṅkṣā*;—
 nt-Part —
 m-Part —
 Ger I — Abstr I —
 Inf —
Sub — Opt —
 Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

Since TB has a Prs IXb as part of a kausativum, it is likely that the TA Prs VIII also goes back to an *sk*-present.

SEM. The manuals translate both grundverb and kausativum by 'betören' (WTG, 270; TEB II, 128 and 225), but we would rather expect an intransitive grundverb and an oppositional transitive or causative, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 34f., fn. 1 with ref. to Couvreur, 1956, 72, who proposed a meaning 'verlangen, irre werden' for the grundverb. Unfortunately, the only finite form of the grundverb attested beyond doubt, the Sub *yāṅkaṃ* in 516 b 1, has no clear context: *ke ––– w(·)r pālkaṃ yāṅkaṃ wat*. Hilmarsson, 1991b, 141 translates the form intransitively: "will look or be spellbound/enchanted". The kausativum, on the other hand, has certainly the transitive meaning 'delude, bewitch someone' (e.g., in 109 a 10). ETYM. Hilmarsson, 1991b, 141f. derives the root from a variant with infixed nasal of PIE *√Hi̯aĝ 'verehren' (Ved. *yájati* 'sacrifices', etc.) he claims was "a part of the religious and ritualistic vocabulary of the proto-language" (²LIV, 224, without Toch.).

yāt⁽ᵃ⁾- 'fähig sein', 'be (cap)able' (itr) (m/a/a)

Prs IV (m) -,-, *yototär*;-,-, *yotontär* Imp -,-, *yotitär*; —
 nt-Part —
 m-Part —
 Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub V (a) -,-, *yātaṃ*; — Opt -,-, *yāto-ñ*;-,-, *yātoye-ś* (S)
 Ger II *yātalle* Abstr II *yātalñe* Priv —
 Inf *yātatsi*
Pt I (a) -,-, *yatā-ne*;—
PPt *yayātau* | *yayātaṣ*
Ipv —

Instead of a 3.sg. middle *yatāte* in 109 a 10, Schmidt, 1974, 34, fn. 6 and 39f. rather wants to read a 3.sg. active *yatā-ne*: *ṣe ka yatāne ñis yāṅkässi • śukentasa swaro(na)* "nur einmal gelang es ihr [scil. Yaśodharā], mich mit süßen Genüssen zu betören". Thomas, ²TochSprR(B), 262, objects to this reading, because there is, according to him, no positive argument for it; but one can indeed support Schmidt's claim, because preterits in this kind of paradigm are mostly actives (see chap. Prs III/IV 26.2.4.). A second possible middle preterit *yatamai* may be attested in H 149.171 b 4, but the context is

unclear: //// (oro)ccem tewpem kem po yata[mai] //// (restoration according to Broomhead I, 208); Schmidt, 1974, 40 rather interprets the form as Pt II of yät⁽ᵃ⁾- 'adorn' (see s.v.). The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. The Priv ayātaicce is semantically unclear, but Hilmarsson, 1991, 60f. is correct in stating that 'unsubdued, untamed' is more likely than 'indomitable'. Beside the attestations given in WTG, 271, we have the following: ayātaiccu (voc.) in PK AS 17K a 3, ayātaicce in PK AS 17H b 4 and in PK AS 5D a 2 (all unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.); for the Priv see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.2.

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'zähmen', 'tame' (tr) (a/-/a)

      Prs VIII (a) -,-, yātṣäm;— Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf —
      Pt III (a) yātwa,-,-;—
      PPt —
      Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs yātṣäm is attested in 201 a 3 (M), and since this is a prose text "kann also nicht, wie bisher angenommen, aus *yātäṣṣäm (Prs. IX b) metrisch verkürzt sein", according to Schmidt, 1974, 26, fn. 3; and although Thomas, 1979, 177f., fn. 149 showed that this kind of syncope is indeed sometimes attested "in Prosatexten" written in the informal and eastern varieties of TB (see the discussion in chap.s Prs/Sub IX and Pt IV), Schmidt's analysis is strongly backed by the 1.sg. Pt III yātwa in 365 b 6 (see Schmidt, 1974, 26, fn. 3 contra WTG, 274 and Thomas, 1979, 178, fn. 149) and also by the existence of a Sub VII in TA.

KAUSATIVUM II 'befähigen, zähmen', 'enable, tame' (tr) (-/x/m)

      Prs IXb — Imp —
           nt-Part yātäṣṣeñca (MQ)
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub IXb (x) — Opt -,-, yātäṣṣi/yātaṣṣi (sic);—
           | yātäṣṣimar,-, yātäṣṣītär;—
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf yātässi
      Pt II (m) —;-,-, yātante
      Pt IV (m) -, yātäṣṣatai (MQ), yātäṣṣāte (sic);—
      PPt yayātäṣṣu| yayātäṣṣoṣ
      Ipv —

The 3.pl.mid. Pt II yātante is attested in THT 1250 a 2 without much context: //// [ts](·)[r]nta taisa yātante • "the ... therefore enabled". The small fragment in which the 3.sg.mid. Pt IV yātäṣṣāte is found (H 150.104 b 5) can be an MQ text. The PPt yayātäṣṣu is found in 310 b 1. There is a slight difference in

meaning between the antigrundverb (Prs VIII/Pt III) and the kausativum (Prs IX/Pt IV) inasmuch as the kausativum can have the additional meaning 'enable'.

= ᴬ*yāt⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'fähig sein', 'be (cap)able' (itr) (m/a/-)

    Prs IV (m) -,-, *yatatär*; — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *yatmāṃ*
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub V (a) -,-, *yātaṣ*;-,-, *yāteñc* Opt -,-, *yātiś-śi*; —
        Ger II *yātal* Abstr II *yātlune*
    Pt I in
    PPt *yāytu*
    Ipv —

According to TG, 487 ("Nachträge"), TA *yatatär* in A 17 b 3 belongs to this root (cf. also Sieg, Übers. I, 21, fn. 6: = Skt. *sampadyate*), and the same is probably true for (almost contextless) TA *yatmāṃ* in A 459 b 3.

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'befähigen, zähmen', 'enable, tame' (tr) (a/m/-)

    Prs VIII (a) -,-, *yātäṣ*;-,-, *yātseñc* Imp — ;-,-, *yātṣānt*
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I *yātäṣlyes* Abstr I —
        Inf *yātässi*
    Sub VII (m) *yātñmār*,-,-; — Opt —
        Ger II *yātñal* (sic) Abstr II —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√i̯et 'sich (fest) hinstellen' (²LIV, 313f.); see Adams, DoT, 490 with ref. The root vowel -*ā*- cannot always been explained as a result of *ā*-umlaut; at least in the TB Pt III, TB Prs VIII, and TA Sub VII -*ā*- must rather derive from a pre-PT *-*ō*-, and pre-PT *i̯ōt- is best assigned to a Narten perfect; Narten behavior of this root is also attested by RV *yatāná-*.

yām- 'machen', 'do' (tr) (x/x/x)

    Prs IXa (x) *yamaskau/maskau, yamast/mas, yamaṣṣäṃ/maṣṣäṃ*;
        -, *maścer, yamaskeṃ | yamaskemar, yamastar, yamastär/*
        mastär, yamaskemtär,-, *yamaskentär/maskentär*
        Imp -,-, *yamaṣṣi/maṣṣi*;-,-, *yamaṣyeṃ | -,-, yamaṣṣitär/*
        maṣitär;-,-, *yamaṣyentär*
        nt-Part *yamaṣṣeñca*
        m-Part *yamaskemane*
        Ger I *yamaṣṣälle* Abstr I —
    Sub I+II (x) *yāmu, yāmt, yāmäṃ*; *yamem*,-, *yāmeṃ |*
        yāmmar, yāmtar, yāmtär; *yamamtär*,-, *yamantär*

                Opt *yamim,-, yāmi; yāmyem, yamīcer, yāmyeṃ* |
                yamīmar, yāmītār, yamītär, yamiyemtär,-,-
                Ger II *yamalle* Abstr II *yamalñe* Priv *ayāmätte*
                Inf *yāmtsi*
    Pt IV (x) *yamaṣṣāwa/yāmṣawa/maṣṣawa, yamaṣasta/yāmṣasta,*
                yamaṣṣa/ yāmṣa/maṣṣa; maṣam, yāmṣaso, yamaṣṣare/
                yāmṣare/yamaṣṣar-me/ yāmṣar/maṣṣare/yamaṣṣere |
                yamaṣamai/ yāmṣamai, yamaṣatai/yāmṣatai, yamaṣṣate/
                yāmṣate; yamaṣṣamnte (S), *yamaṣat, yamaṣṣante*
    PPt *yāmu* | *yāmoṣ*
    Ipv III (x) *pyām; pyāmtso* | *pyāmtsar; pyāmtsat; pyamttsait* (MQ)
The 2.sg.mid. Prs *yamastar* is attested in PK Cp 36, 32, a MQ form *yamästär* in
PK AS 12D b 2 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the
3.pl. Pt *yamaṣṣar-me* (sic) in PK AS 18B b 4 (Pinault, 2008, 78); the 1.pl. Sub
yamem is found in the Paris monastery record PR (= PK Cp) 36, 41 (Couvreur,
1954, 91). Informal-style variants with the stem allomorph *mask-/maṣṣ-* are
quite often attested in texts of profane nature; see Pinault, 1984a, 31; Schmidt,
1986a, 645ff., and most recently Peyrot, 2008, 160f. The wall graffito Qu 34
shows the 2.sg. Pt variants *yamaṣasta* and *yāmṣasta* (Pinault, 1994a, 175f.;
2000a, 158); the odd 3.pl. Pt *yamaṣṣere* is found in KVāc 16 b 5 (Schmidt, 1986,
49). In metrical texts, there are also syncopated forms such as 3.sg. Prs
yāmṣäṃ, 1.pl. Prs *yāmskemtär*, or 3.pl. Prs *yāmskeṃ*; see also Thomas, 1979,
174ff. The subjunctive stem shows both athematic and thematic forms. The
manuals take this stem to be basically athematic; differently Winter, 1993, 202
= 2005, 446 (without discussion). Since thematization of athematic paradigms
is a common process most commonly attested in 1.pl. and 3.pl. forms, and
since (*)*yāme-* is precisely found in such a form, we certainly have to do with
a secondarily thematized stem (see also Schmidt, 1985, 429).
= ^A^**yām-** 'machen', 'do' (tr) (-/x/x)
        Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
    Sub II (x) *yāmam, yāmät, yāmäṣ;-,-, yāmeñc* | *yāmmār,-, yāmtär;-,-,*
                yāmantär Opt *yāmim, yāmit, yamiṣ; yāmimäs,-,-* | *yāmimār,*
                yāmitār, yāmitär;-,-, yamintär
                Ger II *yāmäl* Abstr II *yāmlune*
    Pt 0 (m) *yāmwe, yāmte,-;* —
    Pt III (x) *yāmwā, yāmäṣt, yāmäs;-,-, yāmär* | *yāmtse,-, yāmtsāt/*
                yāmṣāt;-, yāmtsāc, yāmtsānt
    PPt *yāmu*
    Pt IV in
    PPt *yāmṣu*
    Ipv III (x) *pyām/pyāmā-m; pyāmäs* | *pyāmtsār; pyāmtsāc*

ᴬya(p)- 'do' provides the suppletive present stem. A 2.sg. Sub TA *(yā)mät* (with future semantics) is restored in A 270 b 4 by Pinault, 1997, 132. The 1.sg.mid. Opt *yāmimār* is also attested in SHT 6, 1281, and the 3.sg. Pt 0 *yāmä(t)* is to be restored in A 375 b 5, according to Winter, 1976a, 29 = 2005, 165, while TG, 457 proposed restoration to a 3.pl. active TA *yāmä(r)*; the remains of the akṣara visible after ⟨ma⟩ in the manuscript do not give a clue as to which assumption is more likely, but Winter's guess is a morphologically plausible one. The PPt in A 354 b 5 that looks like a form from a kausativum paradigm does not have causative semantics but means "das Unerschaffene" (= nirvāṇa); see Schmidt, 1989, 79. Accordingly, this is just an innovative form showing the same kind of suffixal enlargement that is met in Tocharian B. Sᴇᴍ. The middle has only rarely passive function, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 80, 228f., 337ff., 422ff., 461ff. It is interesting to note that there does not seem to be a semantic difference between the middle root preterit and the middle *s*-preterit forms, as both occur in the same phrases, cf. A 253 b 6 *pñi yāmte* "du hast dir gutes Verdienst erworben" (Schmidt, 1974, 435) beside A 346 b 4 *pñintu yāmtsāc* "welche Verdienste habt ihr erworben?" (Schmidt, 1974, 436). Eᴛʏᴍ. See Adams, DoT, 492, and for a derivation from *√i̯em 'ausstrecken, hinstrecken' (²LIV, 312) now also Peters, 2004, 429ff. with ref.

yās⁽ᵃ⁾- 'erregt sein', 'be excited' (itr) (-/-/m)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I (m) -,-, *yasāte*; —
        PPt *yayāsaṣ*
        Ipv —
Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'erregen', 'excite' (tr) (a/-/-)
        Prs IXb (a) -,-, *yāsäṣṣäṃ*; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ./Eᴛʏᴍ. WTG, 273, 275 and TEB II 226 and 227 correctly set up two synchronically different roots *yās-* and *yäs-*. *yäs-* 'excite (sexually)' is transitive and a root without A-character, whereas the grundverb of *yās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be excited' (in non-sexual sense) is intransitive and clearly a root with A-character. Pace

the analysis in WTG, 275 and TEB II, 227, the 3.sg. Pt *yasāte* in 366 b 3 rather belongs to this root *yās*⁽ᵃ⁾-, and not to *yäs*-, because a Class I preterit from *yäs*- should most probably turn out as †*yṣāte*.

yāsk- 'betteln, bitten', 'beg' (tr) (m/m/m)
  Prs IXa (m) *yaskaskemar,-, yaskastär;* — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I *yaskaṣṣälle* Abstr I —
  Sub II (m) -,-, *yāṣtär; yaskemtär,-,-* Opt —;-,-, *yaṣyemtär*
    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
    Inf *yaṣṣi* (sic)
  Pt I (m) -, *yaṣṣātai, yaṣṣāte-ne;* —
  PPt *yayāṣṣoṣ*
  Ipv —
According to Thomas (apud TEB II, "Berichtigungen zu Band I", p. 264 and 1965, 194), one has to read 1.pl. Sub *yaskemtär* instead of *yaskamtär* (thus, e.g., WTG, 273) in Amb (= PK NS 32) a 6. The 3.sg. *yäṣträ* in 143 a 3 (MQ) is analyzed as a form of this root by WTG, 273, but ⟨ä⟩ for /ā/ would be odd also in an MQ text; for the passage, see the discussion below under *yäs*- 'excite, touch (sexually)'. The Inf *yaṣṣi* is attested in PK Cp 40 b 4 (Pinault, 1994b, 102), the 2.sg. Pt *yaṣṣātai* three times in KVāc (Schmidt, 1986, passim), and now also in the small Prātimokṣa fragment THT 1374 frg. z a 2; the PPt *yayāṣṣoṣ* is also found in the small fragment IOL Toch 941 a 2 (cf. Tamai, 2007, s.v.). Etym. The root is apparently derived from a pre-PT *sk*-present (directly continued in the Sub II); there exist at least two plausible etymological options: "ved. *yā-* 'bitten'", etc. [see also Adams, DoT, 494] and "uridg. *dih₂-s̑ke/o-" belonging to Gk. δίζημαι "1. *suchen* ..., 2. ... *etw.* ... *erstreben*", as per Hackstein, 1995, 185f.

yäk͏ᵃ- 'nachlässig sein', 'be careless, neglect' (itr) (m/m/-)
  Prs Xa (m) -,-, *yäknāstär;* — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub VI (m) —;-,-, *yäknāntär* Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
    Inf —
  Pt I in
  PPt *ykauwo| ykoṣämts*
  Ipv —
The restoration to *(yä)knāsträ* in 12 a 6 is certain.
= ᴬ**yäk͏ᵃ-** 'nachlässig sein', 'be careless, neglect' (itr) (m/m/-)
  Prs X (m) -, *yäknāṣtār,-;* — Imp —
    nt-Part —

                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
                    Inf —
            Sub VI (m) — Opt -,-, *yäknāśśitär*; —
                    Ger II — Abstr II —
            Pt I in
            PPt *yko*
            Ipv —

For the Opt, see the discussion in chap. Opt 23.2.2. ETYM. Said to derive from a PIE root *$\sqrt{}$h₁eĝ/gH 'ermangeln' by ²LIV, 231; cf. Adams, DoT, 494; but derivation from a *(H)iK- would be more attractive.

*yäks*ᵃ- 'umklammern, umarmen', 'entangle, embrace' (tr) (m/-/-)
            Prs VI (m) -,-, *yäksanatär-ne*; — Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
            Sub V — Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                    Inf *yaksatsi*
            Pt I in
            PPt *yäksau* (MQ)
            Ipv —

The Inf *yaksatsi* is attested in THT 1262 a 3: //// *laryai ramno yaksatsi* "... as to embrace a beloved (woman)". Hence, the subjunctive seems to belong to the class with persistent initial accent.

= ᴬ*yäks*ᵃ- 'umklammern, umarmen', 'entangle, embrace'
            (tr) (-/m/m)
            Prs — Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
                    Inf —
            Sub V (m) -,-, *yäksātär*; — Opt —;-,-, *yäkṣintr-äṃ*
                    Ger II — Abstr II —
            Pt I (m) -,-, *yäksāt*; —
            PPt *yäkso*
            Ipv —

TA *[yä]ksātär* (TG, 459: "Frgm.") is attested in THT 1149 a 4.

ETYM. Unclear. Adams, 1989a, 8ff., compared IIr. *$\sqrt{}$i̯akš 'appear' and Rigved. *yā́śu-* '± sexual embrace', deriving all forms together with the Toch. nouns *yakso* '± food stuff' and *yäkṣiye* 'flour' from PIE *$\sqrt{}$i̯eK̂ + s 'press, squeeze'; on the latter two nouns, see also Isebaert, 1995, 298 (*h₂u̯eiĝ-s-eh₂ 'produit de céréales' as in Lat. *avena* 'oat'). Adams, DoT, 496 now calls his own former approach "superseded", without offering another one. Note that in this root, PT *-ks- was preserved in Tocharian A and not turned into †-*ps*-.

yät⁽ᵃ⁾- 'geschmückt sein', 'be decorated' (itr) (-/-/m)

       Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
       Pt I (m) -,-, *ytāte*; —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

The intransitive grundverb form *ytāte* is arguably attested in PK AS 13E b 7 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.): //// *(-)rmeṃ riṃne ytāte •* "… was decorated in the cities".
Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'schmücken', 'adorn, decorate' (tr) (m/-/m)

       Prs IXb (m) —;-,-, *yatäskentär* Imp -,-, *yatäṣṣitär*; —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub IXb — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf *yatästsi* (MQ)
       Pt II (m) *yātamai-ne*, *yātatai*,-; —
       PPt *yaitu* | *yaitoṣ*
       Ipv II (a) *pīta*;-

The active Prs *yatäṣṣäṃ* listed in TEB I, 212, § 381 is probably only reconstructed; a 3.pl.mid. Prs *yätäske(ntär)* can be restored in THT 1860 a 1. The 1.sg.mid. Pt *yātamai* is attested in PK AS 17.6 a 6 (Couvreur, 1954, 89), and probably also in THT 3042 a 1 and in THT 1392 frg. g b 2: *ytāri yātamai* "I decorated the road". The same form in MQ orthography is found in H 149.171 b 4 (Broomhead I, 208; Schmidt, 1974, 40): //// *(oro)cceṃ tewpeṃ keṃ po yata[mai]* //// "I adorned the (gre)at mines [and] the earth completely". On the other hand, Schmidt, 1974, 26, fn. 3 (contra WTG, 274) analyzes *yātwa* in 365 b 6 as a form from *yāt⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be capable' and not from this root. The 2.sg.mid. Pt *yātatai* is attested in KVāc 12 a 3 (Schmidt, 1986, 45) and in PK NS 48 + 258 a 3 (Pinault, 1994, 185). *pīta* in 94 b 2 has been ably analyzed as imperative from this root by Hilmarsson, 1991c, 76, with fn. 4 (traditionally, the form is connected with *pito* 'price'; see most recently Schmidt, 2001, 326).
= *ᴬyät-* 'schmücken', 'sich schmücken', 'adorn', 'adorn oneself' (tr) (m/m/m)

       Prs VIII (m) *ytäsmār*,-, *ytäṣtär*; — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *ytäsmāṃ*
            Ger I *ytäṣlis* Abstr I —
            Inf *ytässi*

Sub IX (m) — Opt *ytāṣimār*,-,-; —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt II (m) *yete*,-,-;-,-, *yetānt*
PPt *yetu*
Ipv —

The forms analyzed as grundverb forms of this root by TG, 459 all rather belong to ᴬ*yāt⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be capable', as per TG, 487 ("Nachträge").

Sᴇᴍ. The TA verb belongs to the small group of media tantum that were basically transitive, but could also be used with direct-reflexive semantics; in the latter case, forms from this root were construed with an instrumental and had the meaning 'adorn oneself with' (Schmidt, 1974, 306); in addition, the middle can also have passive function (Schmidt, 1974, 246). Eᴛʏᴍ. Usually derived from PIE *√i̯et 'sich (fest) hinstellen', see ²LIV, 313f., where *yāt⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be capable' in connected.

yätkᵃ?- '?' (?) (—)
        Prs IX — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *yätkaskemane* (MQ)
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

WTG, 270 lists an *m*-Part *yäṅkaskemane* with the remark "sic!" under the root *yāṅk*- 'betören' as being attested in PK AS 12D a 2 (MQ); but the form has rather to be read *yätkaskemane*, as already suggested by Couvreur, 1954, 84 and now confirmed by G.-J. Pinault, p.c. Unfortunately, the passage is not clear: //// *ñäke mā yärṣalle[ś]cä snai ttuwerñe ñemo yätkaskemane nanātṟa mā yärsemane ṃapi ṣaswā [nā]* ////. D. Q. Adams (p.c.) proposes a meaning 'strive', so that we may have a cognate of ᴬ*yätkᵃ*- (see below, s.v.): "now he does not appear to the honored one seeking a name [i.e. reputation]" (*snai ttuwerñe* remains unclear; the reading *tt* is certain; for this kind of gemination in sandhi, see chap. Sound Laws 1.8.). The MQ writing *yätkask*- points to a stem with A-character; see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.4.

ᴬ*yätkᵃ*- '?' (?) (—)
        Prs III — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *yätkal* Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —

       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

According to Schneider, 1941, 48, the root meaning may be '± erstreben' judging by the attestations in A 157 b 1 and A 220 a 1, which is possible and may also fit the TB hapax of the possible cognate root *yätk*^{ā?}- (see s.v.), but remains uncertain in the end.

yän- 'go' → *i-* 'id.'

yänm^(a)*-* 'erlangen, erreichen', 'achieve, reach' (tr) (x/x/a)
        Prs Xa (x) *yänmāskau*,-, *yänmāṣṣäṃ*;-, *yänmaścer* (MQ),
              yänmāskeṃ | -,-, *yänmāstär*;— Imp —
              nt-Part *yänmāṣṣeñca*
              m-Part *yänmāskemane*
              Ger I *yänmāṣälyī* Abstr I —
        Sub I (a) -,-, *yonmäṃ*;— Opt —
              Ger II — Abstr II — Priv *ainmitte*
              Inf —
        Sub VI (x) *yänmau* (MQ),-, *yaṃnmaṃ* (MQ)/ *yänmān* (MQ);
              -, *yanmacer* (Š)/*yänmacer* (sic),- | — ; -,-, *yänmāntär*
              Opt *yänmoym*,-, *yanmoy*;-,-, *yänmoyeṃ*/*yanmoṃ*/
              yänmoṃ (MQ)
              Ger II *yänmālle* Abstr II *yänmalyñe* (MQ) Priv *ainmacce*
              Inf *yänmātsi*
        Pt III (a) *yonwā* (MQ), *yonmasta*, *yonmasa*;—
        PPt *yainmu* | *yainmoṣo*
        Ipv —

The subjunctive form *yonmäṃ* can in theory also be analyzed as Sub II, but the root vocalism suggests rather Sub I. According to Thomas, 1987a, 87, the form *yemneu̯* in PK AS 18 B a 2 is not a 1.sg. Sub from this root, but a noun, which then was translated by Schmidt, 1997, 234 as 'Torwärter' (contra Couvreur, 1955, 115 and Pinault, 1984, 379). The Priv *ainmitte* 'one who has not yet obtained' is attested in a graffito in the 'Treppenhöhle' in Qizil, according to Schmidt, 2001b, 80, and the obliquus of yet another Priv *(ai)nmacce* is to be restored with certainty in the Udānavarga text TX 5 b 5 (MQ, now = THT 1362) being an equivalent of Skt. *aprāpte* 'not achieved' (Thomas, 1974, 97). The 1.sg. Opt *yänmoym* is also found in PK AS 17J b 3 (Pinault, 1994, 116); on the other hand, there does not exits a 1.sg. Opt *yänmoym* in 206 a 2 (thus WTG, 275), because the reading and restoration to *(yä)[n]moy mā* proposed by TochSprR(B), s.v., makes more sense. The 3.sg. Opt *yanmoy* is found in PK AS 17C a 1 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). A 3.pl. Opt *yanmoṃ* is arguably attested in 362 a 7 (MQ), and a variant of this form *yänmoṃ* in 517 b 3 (MQ character; see Adaktylos et al., 2007, 41). The Ger II *yänmālle* is found in PK AS 12C b 2 (MQ, unpublished,

reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.); for the homonymous member of compound °*yänmālle*, see s.v. *yäp-* 'enter'. According to Schmidt, 1997, 236f., a 1.sg. Pt *yolmuwa* (sic) from this root is attested in a text kept by the Regional Museum in Ürümqi, but this remains doubtful. The nom.pl. PPt *yainmoṣo* is found in PK AS 17A b 3 (Pinault, 1984b, 169).

KAUSATIVUM IV 'erlangen lassen', 'make obtain' (tr) (—)

       Prs — Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub Xb — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
             Inf *yanmässi*
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

~ ᴬ*yom*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'erlangen, erreichen', 'achieve, reach' (tr) (a+/a/a)

       Prs X (a+) —;-,-, *yomnāseñc* Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part *yomnāsmāṃ*
             Ger I — Abstr I —
             Inf —
       Sub VI (a) -, *yomnāt, yomnāṣ;-, yomnāc, yomneñc* Opt -,-, *yämniṣ;*—
             Ger II — Abstr II *yomnālune*
       Pt III (a) -,-, *yomäs;-,-, yomär*
       PPt *yomu*
       Ipv —

A 2.sg. Pt TA *(yomä)ṣt* is restored in A 244 a 4 on the evidence of the Sanskrit parallel version by Schmidt, 1980a, 341; differently, Pinault, 2008, 285 restores here a 2.sg. Pt *(yāmä)ṣt* from ᴬ*yām-* 'do'. In YQ 3 a 7 a 3.sg. (not 2.pl. as given in the index of Ji/Winter/Pinault) Pt TA *yomäs* from this root is assured by the Old Turkish parallel version; see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 56ff. with fn. 9 (pace Thomas, 1991, 8, fn. 11, the reading is not to be doubted). Thomas, 2003, 308 wants to read TA *yämniṣ-ñi* in YQ 36 a 6, which was also proposed as an alternative reading by Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 249 sub *yämni* and by Schmidt, 1999b, 282. Differently from both Ji/Winter/Pinault and Schmidt — who refrained from further analysis — Thomas connected *yämni* precisely with this root; and whereas philology neither speaks in favor nor against such an assumption, this is no doubt the best analysis from a morphological point of view. Similar TA *yämniṣ-äṃ* is probably attested in A 204 a 2 without much context. The irregular PPt TA *yomu* was most likely coined on TA *yāmu* 'done' either in the same way or on the model of, and should not be taken for an outcome of the pre-PT "*(i)ēm-u-* < *h_1eh_1m-u-*" that was set up by Saito, 2006, 564.

SEM. The middle *yänmāsträ* in 251 a 6 is passive (Schmidt, 1974, 230f.); the middle *yänmānträ* in 409 b 5 is either a passive ("... disappearance, all things

are achieved”), or not (Adams, DoT, 498). Etym. The additional -*n*- met in Tocharian B is said by Adams, DoT, 498 to have spread from a nasal present stem *yämnā-, and a stem in surfacing -*nā*- is indeed met in Tocharian A. However, one does not expect a present in (*)-*nā*- to be built from a root with a Pt III, and the Sub I forms *yonmäṃ* and *ainmitte* precisely suggest that the stem in (*)-*nā*- was simply owed to a regularization of a former present stem in rare *-nä-; the Sub I of TB and the Prs X found in both TB and TA then may ultimately go back to forms in *-(m)n-t- and *-(m)n-sk- in which an *-n- had developed out of, or after, *-m- in front of the dental consonants *-t- and *-s- (cf. chap. Prs/Sub X 33.2.). -*o*- acting as root vowel is due to *u*-umlaut caused by a prop vowel *-ä- turned into *-u- after the labial *-m- (cf. chap. Sound Laws 1.6.). As for the etymology, the root can be derived from *√h₁em ‘nehmen’ (²LIV, 236), as suggested by Jasanoff, 1978, 32 and Saito, 2006, 564, but it may be safer (as per Adams, DoT, 498) to resort again to *√i̯em ‘ausstrecken, hinstrecken’ (²LIV, 312) as in the case of *yām*- ‘make’.

yä̆p- ‘eintreten’, ‘untergehen (Sonne)’, ‘enter’, ‘set (sun)’ (itr) (a+/a/a)

    Prs I — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I *yänmalle* Abstr I —
    Prs Xa (a+) *yänmaskau*,-, *yänmaṣṣäṃ*;-,-, *yänmaskeṃ* Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *yänmaskemane*
        Ger I *yänmaṣṣälle* Abstr I —
    Sub I (a) *yopu*,-, *yopäṃ-ne* (Š);-,-, *yäpäṃ* (MQ)
        Opt *yapim*, *yapit*, *yapi*; *yäpyem* (MQ),-,-
        Ger II — Abstr II *yapälñe* (sic) Priv —
        Inf *yaptsi*
    Pt III (a) -,-, *yopsa*;-,-, *yopar*
    PPt *yaipu* | *yaipoṣ*
    Ipv III (a) *pyop*;-

The 3.pl. Sub *yäpäṃ* seems attested in THT 1859 a [= recte b] 1 (MQ), the 1.pl. Opt *yä[p]ye[m]* is found in PK AS 12D b 6 (MQ), the Abstr *yapälñe* ‘entering’ in PK NS 54 a 5 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; the latter is also quoted by Broomhead II, 314 by the older signature [FK] 1086). A 2.sg. Pt *yo(pasta)* is tentatively restored by TochSprR(B) in 368 b 2, and so is a 2.pl. Ipv *(pyo)päs* in 375 b 4; as for the latter restored form, note that otherwise only 2.pl. forms of Ipv III in -*so* are found.

Kausativum I ‘eintreten lassen’, ‘let enter’ (tr) (x/-/-)

    Prs IXb (x) -,-, *yapäṣṣäṃ*; — | -,-, *yapästär*;— Imp —
        nt-Part *īpäṣṣeñca*
        m-Part —
        Ger I *īpäṣṣälle*/*yapäṣṣälle* Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

           Inf —

Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

īpäṣṣeñca is a lexicalized form that functions as equivalent of Skt. *pātayantika-*. In the Pratītyasamutpāda text THT 1558 one also finds *īp-* written in Ger I forms; actually, in this text there is a variation of *īpäṣṣälle*, *yapäṣṣäle*, and *ipäṣle.*

= ᴬ*yäw-* 'eintreten', 'enter' (itr) (-/-/a)

       Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt III (a) -,-, *yowäs;—*
       PPt *yaiwu*
       Ipv —

TG, 461 proposes that TA *yowā* in A 111 a 2 is a 1.sg. Pt from this root, but this is uncertain because of the fragmentary context. To be sure, TA *yowā* would be the expected form of the 1.sg. active Pt (cf. Winter, 1965a, 207 = 1984, 174 = 2005, 132, fn. 1), and TA *yowā tsakäl* would make more sense than TA *wātsakäl*; but pace Poucha (TLT 391, s.v. 1. *tsäk-*), TA *tsakäl* could hardly belong to ᴬ*tsäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pull', and a root ᴬ*tsak-* would also remain unclear.

SEM./ETYM. The grundverb is basically intransitive, but since we are dealing with a verb of motion it can be construed with an obliquus of direction (e.g., *pintwāt yäp-* "den Almosengang antreten"; see Thomas, 1983, 15). Beside 'enter (e.g., a house)', we also find the special meaning 'set (said of the sun)'; see Winter, 1988, 787f. = 2005, 341f. Clear instances of the latter meaning are *kaunantse yaipormeṃ* "because of the sunset" (cf. Thomas, 1969, 243 without ref.; the passage can now be identified as THT 1681 b 5); *kauṃ-yap[ts]i täntsi* "until sundown" in PK AS 18B a 1 and a 3 (Pinault, 2008, 79), and *kau<ṃ> ya[p](ts)i* in a parallel Berlin text (Thomas, 1987, 172; now = THT 1459 a 5). In addition, a second member of compound °*yänmālle* is sometimes interpreted as Ger from this root; it is found in *kauṃ-yänmālle* (PK NS 49 b 3) and *ko[n-y]änmālle* (PK NS 49 b 2) "Sonnenuntergang (?)" (see Bernhard, 1958, 140; Pinault, 1998a, 363). It is obvious that this form acts as an abstract (as per Bernhard, 1958, 139f.; Adams, DoT, 497) made from a stem pre-TB *yämnā-* (which according to Adams, l.c., had been a present stem later replaced by the Prs Xa "perhaps because of its homophony with the subjunctive of *yäm-*"), but neither this stem nor the stem pre-TB *yämnä-* (which could perfectly well have developed out of *yäpnä- phonologically, as per Adams, DoT, 685) met in the Prs Xa (and, as it seems, also in the Ger I *yänmalle* that is attested twice in the Prātimokṣa text 321) make sense morphologically, especially if one takes into consideration the rest of the averbo. Luckily enough, some light is

shed on strange *yänm-* from Tocharian A, where the forms from *ᴬyäw-* all mean 'enter', and not any of them 'set'. There the term for 'west' is TA *koṃ-wmānt*, which Pinault, 1998a, 363 convincingly argued to belong with *kauṃ-yänmālle* also etymologically. As a consequence of this (near-)equation, one could and indeed should assume that in PT there had existed a root **w(')ämā-* (also) denoting 'set', which as any root with A-character could, of course, have formed a nasal present in PT **-nā-*, and the pre-PT *e*-grade allomorph of which would have had to turn into TB *yäm-* by sound law. Accordingly, one is now free to derive formerly enigmatic TB *-yänmā-* precisely from such a PT **w'ämnā-*; on the other hand, *yänma-* from **yänmä-* may have been coined secondarily by some kind of hypercorrection on the model of the root *yänm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'achieve, reach', with which we find a variation between (old) *(*)yo/änmä-* and (innovated) *(*)yänmā-*. As for the fact that the meaning 'set' is not restricted at all to the *(*)yänmā/ä-* forms synchronically belonging to the TB root *yäp-*, it should be noticed that the PIE root **√i̯ebʰ* 'eingehen, eindringen' (²LIV, 309) that clearly (as per Hackstein, 1995, 311f.; Adams, DoT, 497) contributed the by far greater part of the TB paradigms made from *yäp-* (and the whole paradigm made from *ᴬyäw-*) must have taken on notions similar to 'set' also in other branches, to judge from nouns such as Gk. ζόφος 'dusk, gloom, (north)west' (see Adams, DoT, 497; Janda, 2000, 206). As for cognate verbal forms of other branches, these mostly are confined to the meaning 'having sexual intercourse'. Based on Iranian cognates showing a similar neutral meaning 'move, wander, crawl', Cheung, 2007, 213 sets up two different roots PIE **√i̯eb⁽ʰ⁾* 'go, move (slowly) inside' and PIE **√h₃i̯ebʰ* 'have sexual intercourse', which is quite unnecessary. At any rate, the root is not apt to prove a "Frühausgliederung" of Tocharian as was claimed by Schmidt, 1992, 113 and other scholars; cf. Hackstein, 2005, 172. The *o*-vocalism is due to *u*-umlaut; see chap. Sound Laws 1.6.

ᴬyäp- 'do' → *ᴬya(p)-* 'id.'

[*ᴬyäps-* '?'; it is unclear whether TA *yä[p]sant* in A 70 b 4 is an *nt*-Part (with odd *-sant* instead of *-sānt*) from an otherwise unattested verbal root or a nominal stem. Despite the fact that the text is identifiable, the passage remains unclear, cf. Thomas, 1989, 20f., who merely refers to the translation 'Jahreszeiten' suggested by Sieg.]

ᴬyär⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich baden; sich (rituell) reinigen', 'bathe; purge oneself (ritually)'

    (?) (—)
    Prs X — Imp —
         nt-Part —
         m-Part —
         Ger I — Abstr I —
         Inf *yärnässi*
    Sub — Opt —
         Ger II — Abstr II —

Pt I in
PPt in *yāyrurāṣ*
Ipv —

The Inf TA *yä(r·)āssi* in A 227/8 a 2 can either be restored to TA *yärnāssi* or to TA *yärrāssi* with assimilation; see Hackstein, 1995, 317f. with fn. 93 (the original manuscript is lost); the unpublished fragment in which the mere stem TA *yärnā*- can be read (as per TG, 459), is THT 1154 a 3: //// *sāt wäryo yärnā* //// "with warm water bat(he) ...".

KAUSATIVUM I 'baden, (rituell) reinigen', 'bathe, purge (ritually)' (tr) (m/m/m)

Prs VIII (m) —;-,-, *yärsantär* Imp —
    nt-Part *yärṣantāṃ*
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
    Inf *yrässi*
Sub IX (m) — Opt *yrāṣimār,-,-;*—
    Ger II — Abstr II *yrāṣlune*
Pt II (m) -,-, *yairāt;*—
PPt —
Ipv II (m) *päyrār;*-

The *m*-Part TA *yärsmāṃ* in A 167 a 2 rather belongs to ᴬ*yärs*- 'show respect'; see s.v. ᴬ*yärs*-. The 3.pl. TA *yärsantär* belongs to this root; see the discussion of the passage s.v. ᴬ*pris*- '± sprinkle'. For TA *yärṣantāṃ*, see the ref. in Hackstein, 1995, 317f. The Abstr TA *(yr)ā[ṣ](lune)* is to be restored in A 24 b 3 (Siegling apud Sieg, Übers. I, 28, fn. 14). Transitive Pt II TA *yairāt* is attested in YQ 41 a 5.

SEM. The valency of the grundverb (if Prs X and Pt I are indeed to be assigned to the grundverb) can strictly speaking not be determined, but the meaning 'bathe (itr)' clearly suggests intransitivity (see Hackstein, 1995, 318). On the other hand, the non-finite forms of the Prs VIII seem to have a similar intransitive meaning 'bathe', i.e., the Inf TA *yrässi* in A 20 a 2f. (see Hackstein, 1995, 317: "warmes Wasser zum Baden"), and the *nt*-Part TA *yärṣantāṃ* "ich verehre dich, den, der sich rituell badet" (Hackstein, l.c., with fn. 91). In contrast, the finite forms govern an object, or have at least clearly transitive meaning. ETYM. PIE *√h₁erH 'waschen' (²LIV, 239).

ᴬ**yärk-** '(ver)ehren', 'honor, venerate' (tr) (m/-/m)

Prs VIII (m) —;-,-, *yärksantär* Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
    Inf *yärkässi*
Sub — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt III (m) -,-, *yärksāt;*—
PPt —
Ipv —

TA *yäṣträ* in A 23 a 4 belongs to *ᴬyärs-* 'show respect' (see s.v.).

Eᴛʏᴍ. Usually connected with PIE *√h₁erkᵘ̯ 'strahlen, singen' (²LIV, 240f.). There exist no verbal forms from this root in TB, only the noun *yarke* 'reverence'. In addition, Isebaert, 1992, 290 and, independently, Carling, 2004, 98 proposed that the adjective *erkatte* 'unfriendly' (on its use in a phrase with *yām-* 'verächtlich machen', see Schmidt, 1974, 464, with fn. 1) started out as a Priv based on a Sub V †*yärkā-* from this root by the meaning "peu aimable, inamical, méprisant", resp. "dishonoring, scornful"; but both also point out that in this case one would rather expect *ai-* instead of *e-*; of course, an †*airkatte* would indeed form a perfect equation with the TA adjective *erkāt* 'unfriendly, disdainful'.

*yärtt*ᴮ?- 'zerren', 'drag' (tr) (a+/-/a)
      Prs I + II (a+) -,-, *yarttäṃ*;-,-, *yärtten-ne* Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part *yärtt(amane)*
           Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf —
      Pt I (a) -,-, *yärtta-ne* (sic); —
      PPt *yärttau* (MQ) | *yärtoṣ* (sic)
      Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *yarttäṃ* is attested in PK AS 7M a 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the oblique PPt *yärto[ṣ]* in PK AS 16.2 a 4 (Pinault, 1989a, 161f.). On the evidence of the new form *yarttäṃ* the claim made by Schmidt, 1985, 426 that the stem is thematic because of the ending *-eṃ* has to be rejected (see the discussion about secondarily thematized stems in chap.s Sub I/V and Prs I). The *m*-Part in 85 b 2 is damaged, and due to the new evidence rather has to be restored to *y[ä](rt)t(amane)* (in the parallel passage PK NS 355 b 2 the *m*-Part is completely absent).

= *ᴬyärt*ᴮ?- 'zerren', 'drag' (tr) (m/-/-)
      Prs I/II (m) -,-, *yärtär*; — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part *yärtmāṃ*
           Ger I — Abstr I —
           Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —

Strictly speaking, the TA present stem is ambiguous, but one should rather expect a Prs I because of TB. Middle TA *yärtär* in A 55 b 2 is used as a passive (Schmidt, 1974, 255); the *m*-Part (cited in TG, 460 without ref.) is attested in THT 1483 frg. b b 3 (written TA *yärṭ māṃ*).

Eᴛʏᴍ. Although it has an athematic present, the root has most likely A-character judging by the Pt I and PPt in TB. Note that TB -*tt*- is obviously not to be derived from PT *-tw-; there is no etymology that suggests itself.

yärp- 'achtgeben, aufpassen', 'observe, take care' (tr) (-/-/a)

          Prs VIII in *yirpṣuki* Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
          Sub I/II — Opt —
                    Ger II *yärpalle* (MQ) Abstr II — Priv *airpäcce/airpittona*
                    Inf —
          Pt III (a) -,-, *yerpsa*; —
          PPt —
          Ipv III (a) –; *pirpso*
          Ipv VI (a) *pīrpe*;–

A present stem of Class VIII is postulated on the evidence of the nomen agentis *yirpṣuki* (denoting some kind of official title such as 'inspector'). According to Hilmarsson, 1991, 106ff., the Priv *airpätte* 'unbeachtet, sorglos' belongs to this root (differently, Schmidt, 1986, 130 ad KVāc 12 b 4). The Class of the subjunctive stem is ambiguous despite the claim made by Hilmarsson 1991, 108f. that *i* for *ä* in *airpittona* in KVāc 12 b 4 rather points to a thematic stem, because the *y*-insertion can also have been due to the preceding *ai*-diphthong, to judge from *ayātaicce* (based on a Sub V stem *yātā- from *yāt⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'be (cap)able'). The 2.sg. Ipv *pīrpe* is attested in the MQ text PK AS 12B b 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.); the 2.pl. Ipv *pirpso* in H 149.72 a 4 is analyzed as form of a kausativum from *wärp*ᵃ- 'enjoy' by TochSprR(B), glossary, 170 (there are no other forms of a kausativum of this root), but according to WTG, 275 and Broomhead II, 314, this Ipv rather belongs here. Eᴛʏᴍ. Maybe to be derived from PIE *√u̯erbʰ 'enclose', as per Driessen, 2001, 66. Morphologically, the root may also be an antigrundverb to *wärp*ᵃ- 'enjoy, etc.', but the semantics do not back up such a claim.

yärs- 'Verehrung, Zuneigung bezeugen', 'show respect, affection' (itr) (m/-/m)

          Prs II (m) *yärsemār* (MQ),-, *yarṣtär*; *yirsemtär*,-,- Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part *yärsemane*
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
          Sub II — Opt —
                    Ger II *yärṣalle* Abstr II *yärṣalñe* Priv —
                    Inf —
          Pt I (m) *yärṣāmai*,-, *yärṣāte*;-,-, *yirṣānte*
          PPt —
          Ipv —

The Ger II *yärṣalle* is attested in PK AS 12D a 2 (MQ, unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the Abstr *yärṣalñe* in the letter THT 1574 a 1 (=

X 369, published in TEB II, 74 as no. XXXIV, 1), and a variant *yirṣalñe* also in the monastery record PK Cp 32, 1 (Pinault, 1984a, 24); the 1.sg.mid. Pt *yärṣāmai* is found in PK AS 17J b 2 (for the text, see Pinault, 1994, 116; the verbal form has already been cited by Couvreur, 1954, 88), and the 3.sg.mid. Pt *yärṣāte* in THT 1295 b 3.

= ᴬ**yärs-** 'Verehrung, Zuneigung bezeugen', 'show respect, affection'
   (itr) (m/m/m)
   Prs II (m) -,-, *yäṣtär* (sic); — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part *yärsmāṃ*
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub II (m) *yärsmār,-,-;* — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II *yärṣlune*
   Pt I (m) —;-,-, *yärṣānt*
   PPt —
   Ipv —

TA *yäṣträ* in A 23 a 4 has to be emended to TA *yä\<r\>ṣträ* and belongs to this root and not to ᴬ*yärk-* because of its being construed with the allative, as per Schmidt, 1974, 484 with fn. 3 (contra TG, 460 and Couvreur, 1956, 80). The *m*-Part *yärsmāṃ* is without context, but its regular shape is the same that is met in the Sub II form TA *yärsmār* from our root (see also Winter, 1991, 47 = 2005, 424). Despite the argumentation by Winter, 1977, 139 = 1984, 184 = 2005, 176, I take TA *yärsmār* in A 6 b 2 as a subjunctive (following TG, 460), because we have to do with a conditional subordinate clause; on the absence of the thematic vowel -*a*- in TA *yärsmāṃ* and TA *yärsmār*, see chap. Prs II 25.1.3.

Sᴇᴍ. According to Schmidt, 1974, 482ff. and 1980, 407, the root has the meaning 'mit innerer Beteiligung (Verehrung, Scheu, Liebe o.ä.) sprechen'; differently, Thomas, ²TochSprR(B), 258f. The verb is intransitive and construed with the allative.

ᴬ**yäw-** 'enter' → *yäp-* 'id.'

yäs- 'erregen, (sexuell) berühren', 'excite, touch (sexually)' (tr) (m/-/-)
   Prs II (m) -,-, *yaṣtär;-,-, ysentär* Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub II — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II *yaṣñe* (sic) Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —

The 3.sg. *yäṣträ* in 143 a 3 (MQ) looks like a form of this root, but this is not suggested by the (very fragmentary) context: //// *(śault)s(a) wärññai yäṣträ*

ma nrai //// "… lifelong … (s)he, not hel(l)…". WTG, 273 analyzed the form as one of *yāsk-* 'beg', but /ā/ should not be rendered by ⟨ä⟩ in an MQ text. Since we seem to be dealing with a Mahākāvya (as per TochSprR(B)), a form *yäṣtär* 'excites (sexually)' does not seem the most likely guess. More cogent is the proposal by Adams, DoT, 501, to set up a separate root *yäsk-* '± sully' for this stem; see also below s.v. ᴬ*yäsk?-* '?'. The 3.sg. Pt *yasāte* in 366 b 3 cannot be a regular preterit of this root, because one would expect a palatalized form †*yäṣāte*. *yasāte* in this quite fragmentary passage rather belongs to *yās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be excited'; see s.v. Probably a 3.pl. Prs I/Sub I that is construed with the locative of *kektseñe* 'body' is attested in the small fragment THT 2377 frg. r a 4 (MQ character): //// *(ono)lmi kektsenne ysạntṛa ḳ_uce* ////.

Kausativum III '(sexuell) berühren', 'touch (sexually)' (tr) (—)

Prs —	Imp —		
	nt-Part —		
	m-Part —		
	Ger I —	Abstr I —	
Sub IX —	Opt —		
	Ger II —	Abstr II —	Priv —
	Inf *ysissi*		
Pt —			
PPt —			
Ipv —			

The Inf does not have at all the semantics typical of kausativum forms: Fill. M 1 b 6 *ārtärne päknāträ klai{ṃ} ekalmi yāmtsi taine ysissi yoñy<ai>ṣṣe to pwarne hom yamaṣäle s<ā> ekalmi mäsketrä* "in Ārdrā soll man, wenn man die Absicht hat, sich eine Frau zu Willen zu machen, [ihre] {Scham} zu berühren, {ein Schamhaar} als Spende ins Feuer tun. Sie wird [ihm] zu Willen" (reading and translation according to Sieg, 1955, 79 except for the rendering of *taine* and *yoñy<ai>ṣṣe to*, which are left untranslated by Sieg, and for which I follow the translation by Adams, 1987, 3f.; differently, Thomas, 1991a, 298ff. reads *naine* and analyzes it as an adverb).

~ ᴬ*yäs-* 'sieden', 'boil' (?) (a/-/-)

Prs II (a) -,-, *ysäṣ*; —	Imp —		
	nt-Part —		
	m-Part —		
	Ger I —	Abstr I —	
	Inf —		
Sub —	Opt —		
	Ger II —	Abstr II —	
Pt —			
PPt —			
Ipv —			

TA *ysäṣ* is a hapax in A 467 b 2: ////(*o)mälsuneyā wär ysäṣ* "the water boils due to heat" (cf. Couvreur, 1956, 87). The valency is uncertain, TA *wär* can either be subject or object.

SEM. In TB, *yäs-* always has a sexual connotation, whereas the original meaning is apparently preserved in TA. The two present middle forms can be interpreted as passive forms at each of their instances, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 246 for 2 b 7 (although Schmidt himself prefers to analyze 334 a 8f. as deponential or intensive middle; see Schmidt, 1974, 328, 481, and also Schmidt, 1997, 238ff.). ETYM. Synchronically, this root is to be separated from *yās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be excited (in a non-sexual sense)' for morphological and semantic reasons. Diachronically, both *yäs-* and *yās⁽ᵃ⁾-* are ultimately to be derived from PIE *√i̯es 'sieden, schäumen' (²LIV, 312f.); see Adams, DoT, 500f.

yäsk- '± sully' → *yäs-* 'excite, touch (sexually)'

ᴬ*yäsk?-* '?' (?) (−)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II/III in
        PPt *yayäsku*
        Ipv —

The PPt is attested twice (A 10 b 6 and A 193 b 1); while the latter instance is without much context, the former refers to the 'head', so that Sieg, Übers. I, 14 — followed by Couvreur, 1956, 72 — proposed as meaning "etwa 'geschüttelt'"; Lane, 1947, 46 translated "having raised". If the proposal by Adams, DoT, 501 for the hapax *yaṣtär* 'sullies' in 143 a 3 is correct, one may also think to connect both roots and translate A 10 b 6 by "having disfigured the head" vel sim.

yäst?- 'herabstürzen', 'hurl down' (tr) (-/-/a)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I (a) —;-,-, *yastāre* (sic)
        PPt —
        Ipv —

According to TochSprR(B), transl., 75 and glossary, 156, *yasnā* //// in 56 b 6 (Š) has to be read and restored to *(ke)k(ts)eñ yastā(re)* "sie stürzten den Körper herab"; cf. also ²TochSprR(B), 224. Krause, WTG, 276 analyzes *yästäräk* in 394 b 2 as a similar 3.pl. Pt from the same root, which he set up as *yäst-*.

Adams, DoT, 502 makes a similar proposal for *yäsnā* //// attested in the small fragment 147 frg. 4 b 2. Since all of these verbal forms are attested in fragmentary context, the meaning assigned to this root is merely a guess based on what seems a related noun *yäst* 'precipice' (= Skt. *prapāta-*), which is attested in the MQ text 338. If these forms indeed all belong together, the root vowel ought to have been *-ä-*, as proposed by the manuals. In that case, *yastā(re)* must be a misspelling for **yästāre*, because MQ texts do not render /ā/ by ⟨ä⟩, and on the other hand one cannot rule out mere omission of the *ä*-dots, cf. Peyrot, 2008, 34f. Note that a Pt stem **yästā-* would presuppose A-character for the root. ETYM. According to Adams, DoT, 502, the verbal root is denominative to *yast* 'precipice'.

yu- 'erstreben, sich neigen zu', 'seek, aspire to, turn towards' (itr) (x/a/-)
    Prs IXb (x) -, *yuwäst/yust-me* (MQ), *yuwäṣṣäṃ;—* |
        -,-, *yuwästär;—* Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub IXb (a) —;-,-, *yuwäskeṃ* Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —
The 2.sg. Prs *yuwäst* is attested in KVāc 30 b 2 (Schmidt, 1986, 63). *yuwäskeṃ* in K 2 a 6 is Sub and not Prs, according to Sieg, 1938, 7f. On the semantics, see below.
= ^A*yu⁽ä⁾-* 'sich neigen zu', 'turn, incline towards' (itr) (m/-/-)
    Prs III (m) -,-, *ywatr-äṃ;—* Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf *ywatsī*
    Sub V — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *ywālune*
    Pt I in
    PPt *ywont*
    Ipv —
The 3.sg. Prs TA *ywatr-äṃ* is attested in YQ 6 b 2: *ṣkārā ywatr-äṃ* "turns/inclines backwards", cf. Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 106f. It remains uncertain whether TA *ywār* in TA *ypeyis ywālune ywār* in the small fragment A 233 a 2 is 3.pl. Imp (as proposed by TG, 460), or an adverb (see TG, 272, § 389).
KAUSATIVUM III 'streben nach, streben zu', 'zuwenden', 'aspire to, reach out for', 'turn to (tr)' (itr/tr) (a/a/-)
    Prs VIII (a) —;-,-, *yuseñc* Imp -,-, *yuṣā;—*

nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Inf —
Sub IX (a) — Opt -,-, *ywāṣiṣ;* —
Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

SEM. In both languages, what formally seems to be a kausativum is usually construed with the allative only, and accordingly intransitive and what I call Kaus. III; cf. 375 a 1 *akāl(k)iś ... yuwäṣṣäṃ* "whichever wish he reaches out for" (on the other hand, the translations by Schmidt, 1974, 137 ["Zu welchem Wunsch auch immer er reif macht, eben dieser Wunsch geht ihm ganz in Erfüllung"] and Thomas, 1997, 108 ["Zu welchem Wunsch auch immer er selbst reif macht, ebenso der Wunsch wird ihm ganz erfüllt"] lack sense); K 2 a 6 *cmelaśc yuwäskeṃ* "they aspire to (re)birth" and b 1 *tuśc yuwäṣṣäṃ* "aspires to it" (see Sieg, 1938, 7f., contra Lévi, 1933, s.v.); 255 a 1 *(ekñiññenta) skw[ä]nmaṣca śaiṣṣe māka yuwästrä* "(Besitztümern) [und] Glücksgütern wendet sich die Welt sehr zu" (Schmidt, 1974, 296). *yust* in 273 b 3 is construed with an enclitic pronoun: *yust-me wā nnai tallāñciśkaṃ mā west-meśca* "you turn towards us, but the unfortunate ones, you do not speak to them". In Tocharian A we likewise find only an allative in A 394 a 2: *puttiśparṇac yuṣā* "he aspired to Buddhahood", and the fragmentary passage A 181 b 5 ////c *ywāṣiṣ•* also certainly contains an allative. However, both an obliquus and an allative is found in A 302 b 4, where TA *yuseñc* acts as an oppositional transitive: *(–)(·)mäṣ käryāṣ yuseñc puk tosäṃ pñintu metraknac* "[und] aus [ganzem] Selbst [und] Willen alle [ihre] verdienstvollen Taten Maitreya zuwenden", as per Schmidt, 1996, 274. ETYM. To judge from K 2 a 6f., the kausativum paradigm of Tocharian B (and no doubt also that of Tocharian A) had the present *pariṇāmayati* as BHS equivalent (as per Edgerton, BHSD, s.v. with ref.; cf. also vol. I, 188f. § 38.23) that could have the same intransitive semantics as Skt. *pariṇamati*, i.e., on the one hand denote 'bend round (itr), turn (round) (itr), be transformed, change (itr), develop (itr), mature (itr), ripen (itr)' (as it seems, Schmidt and Thomas, ll.cc., were not aware of this fact), and on the other hand denote the respective (oppositional) transitive semantics of its causative (which it actually seems to be on the morphological level). It is then rather obvious that *yu-/ᴬyu⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'aspire to, turn towards' must have quite a lot to do with *yu⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'ripen'. I think that we are actually facing two different calque phenomena in Tocharian: on the one hand, one single root *yu⁽ᵃ⁾-* ended up denoting both '± turn towards (itr)' and 'ripen (itr)' at least in Tocharian B under the influence of and based on the model of BHS *pariṇāmayati* and Skt. *pariṇamati*, both of which could have both meanings (I guess it is far less likely that in both Tocharian and Sanskrit a semantic shift from '± turn towards (itr)' to 'ripen (itr)' had occurred independently); on the other hand,

the respective kausativum paradigms were used intransitively in Tocharian B and both transitively and intransitively in Tocharian A on the very model of BHS *pariṇāmayati*, which was precisely used both ways — but note that there are also some other kausativum forms with intransitive valency (see chap. Valency 4.11.), and that there are even much more intransitive presents with causative morphology to be found in BHS, see Edgerton, BHSD, vol. I, 188f. § 38.23. As for the question of the more original meaning of the Tocharian root (i.e., '± turn towards (itr)' or rather 'ripen (itr)'), I think '± turn towards (itr)' is by far the better choice on account of two arguments already put forth by Hilmarsson, 1991, 127f.: on the one hand, TA *yulā* 'inclined towards' suggests that the TA grundverb paradigm from *ᴬyu⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'turn, incline towards' had once inflected precisely like *yu⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'ripen', and had already at that early, prehistorical stage its historical meaning and not that of 'ripen', and on the other hand, only a root *yu⁽ᵃ⁾-* with the meaning '± turn towards (itr)' could be plausibly etymologized (i.e., connected with what is set up as PIE *√i̯eu̯ 'festhalten, an sich ziehen, verbinden' by ²LIV, 314).

yu⁽ᵃ⁾- 'reifen', 'ripen' (itr?) (—)
   Prs I — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part *yumāne*
     Ger I *yuwalye* (MQ) Abstr I —
   Sub V — Opt —;-,-, *yāwoṃ*
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt I in
   PPt *ywauwa*
   Ipv —

The *m*-Part *yumāne* is also attested in THT 1165 frg. 1 b 3 and maybe in addition in THT 4029 b 4, the Ger I *yuwalye* in H add.149 110 a 2 and a 4 (MQ). As per Adams, DoT, 502, isolated *yāwoṃ* in 593 a 2 is an Opt from this root: *c(e)y yāwoṃ* (word separation proposed by TochSprR(B), fn.). This form is reminiscent of the 3.pl.act. Imp form *śawon* from *śuw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'eat, consume' and may lead to the guess that with respect to Sub and Pt inflection, *yu⁽ᵃ⁾-* had adopted the pattern found with rhyming *śuw⁽ᵃ⁾-*. Adams also analyzes *ywau* //// in 342 b 7 as PPt of this root, but this form is attested in fragmentary context. SEM. The TB *m*-Part has clearly the meaning 'reif, Reifender, zugänglich'; see Dietz, 1981, 143, and cf. the passage 197 a 6 discussed s.v. *ākl-* 'learn'. ETYM. Traditionally, the verb is taken to be the grundverb of *yu-* 'seek, aspire to', and I think with reason; see above s.v. *yu-*.

yuk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'besiegen, überwinden, verdrängen', 'overcome, conquer, vanquish'
   (tr) (a/a/a)
   Prs VIII (a) -,-, *yukṣäṃ*;-,-, *yukseṃ* Imp -,-, *yukṣī-ñ*; —
     nt-Part *yukṣeñca*

         m-Part —
         Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V (a) —;-,-, *yūkaṃ* Opt *yūkoym*,-,-; —
         Ger II — Abstr II *yukalñe* (S) Priv —
         Inf *yukatsy/yukātsi* (MQ?)
    Pt I (a) *yūkāwa*,-, *yukā-ne*; —
    PPt *yukau/yukoṷ* | *yukoṣ*
    Ipv —

The 3.sg. Opt *yukoy* listed in TEB I, 230, § 412,6 is maybe only reconstructed; the Abstr *yukalñe* (sic) is also attested in the small Uv. fragment IOL Toch 367 a 4 (Peyrot, 2008a, 111; provenance unknown), and an Inf variant *yukātsi* is arguably found in the small fragment THT 3603 frg. a b 3 (without context, provenance unknown). The subjunctive stem most likely has persistent initial accent. A 1.sg. Pt *yū[k](āwa)* is restored in PK NS 36+20 b 4 by Couvreur, 1964, 245; see also Schmidt, 2001, 324; the 3.sg. Pt *yuka* is also found in THT 3597 a 8 (MQ, cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 273); the PPt variant *yukoṷ* is attested in IOL Toch 758 b 3 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.).

= ᴬ*yukᵃ*- 'besiegen, überwinden', 'overcome, conquer' (tr) (a/a/-)
    Prs VI (a) -,-, *yuknāṣ*; — Imp —
         nt-Part —
         m-Part —
         Ger I *yuknāl* Abstr I —
         Inf *yuknātsi*
    Sub V (a) -, *yokat*,-; — Opt —
         Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt I in
    PPt *yuko*
    Ipv —

TA *yukā* //// in A 65 b 1 at the beginning of a pāda may be restored to a preterit from this root (thus TG, 460), or to a Ger II TA *yukā(l)* (thus Sieg, Übers. II, 26, fn. 4). The 2.sg. TA *yokat* in A 96 a 4 rather belongs to this root and is neither an irregular subjunctive (thus TEB I, 230, § 412,6) nor present form of ᴬ*yok*- 'drink' (thus Couvreur, 1956, 79): ////*tu penu cam yokat ptsok caṣ wär* "(if) you want to overcome this, (then) drink this water!". The Inf TA *(yu)knātsi* is restored in PK NS 2 b (?) 4 by Couvreur, 1956, 98 (who does not cite a signature; the exact passage quote was provided by G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). Sᴇᴍ. See Hackstein, 1995, 98ff. in detail. The verb is basically transitive denoting 'overcome', but is occasionally to be translated by 'win' plus a locatival phrase, e.g., in S 6 (= PK AS 5C) a 1: *yūkoym weta kleśaṣṣai* (see Hackstein, l.c.: "siegen möchte ich in dem Kleśa-[...]Kampf"), and in 19 a 7: *(mā nta vas)tu tīrthi yūkaṃ* "die Tīrthas sollen (eben nicht) in der Sache siegen" (TochSprR(B), transl., 30; slightly differently, Thomas, ²TochSprR(B), 174: *(manta va)stu)*. Eᴛʏᴍ. Usually derived from PIE *√i̯eu̯ĝ 'be unquiet'; see Adams, DoT, 503; ²LIV, 315 sets up seṭ character *√i̯eu̯ĝH, but apparently only on account of the A-character of the Tocharian root; Kümmel apud ²LIV, 315 reconstructs a nasal present from this root already for PIE, and states that

'besiegt' either derived from 'macht unruhig' or from intransitive 'unruhig sein', both of which hardly make sense. The semantics rather suggest that we have to do with the PIE root *√i̯eu̯g 'anschirren' (²LIV, 316), since 'yoke' could easily turn into 'tame' or 'oppress' (as happened occasionally in Greek), and the verbal stem PT *yäwkā- may actually have started out as an instrumental sg. form of a pre-PT noun denoting 'yoke' that may have formed a perfect equation with Greek ζυγόν, etc. 'id.' (for the semantics, cf. especially Lat. *subiugō* 'subiugate', 'unterjochen'). Hackstein, 1995, 99f. is no doubt perfectly right in claiming that the Prs VIII from this root exclusively found in Tocharian B is to be viewed as a *lectio difficilior*.

^Ayutk^ß- 'sich sorgen', 'be worried' (itr) (m/-/-)

      Prs III (m) -, *yutkatār,-*; — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub V — Opt —
            Ger II *yutkāl* Abstr II *yutkālune*
      Pt I in
      PPt *yutko*
      Ipv —

ETYM. To be derived from *H̯i̯ud^h-sk̂e/o- from PIE *√H̯i̯ud^h 'in Bewegung geraten (ohne Ortsveränderung)' (²LIV, 225f.); see Melchert, 1978, 103 and also Jasanoff, 2004, 148 (*H̯i̯ud^h-sk̂- "'be agitated' vs. Ved. *yúdhyate* 'fights'").

yel^?- '± untersuchen', '± investigate' (?) (—)

      Prs VIII — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I *yelṣalyi* Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —

The manuals propose the meaning 'untersuchen (?)' (cf. WTG, 276). WTG gives two Ger I attestations for the root, but one of them is due to an emendation: *yelpallona* in 192 a 4 "[v]iell. ist *yelṣallona* zu lesen" (TochSprR(B), s.v.); the original manuscript has certainly *p*, but we may nevertheless be dealing with a copyist's mistake, and a meaning '± investigate' works well in this passage: *ñake śak wi āyatanta yelpallona* "now the twelve states (of sensation) are to be investigated" (cf. Couvreur, 1954c, 113, who, however, leaves precisely this verbal form untranslated). The second attestation *yelṣalyi* in 152 a 5 (clearly to be read that way) is construed with

the adverb *päst* 'away, back', and if the meaning '± investigate' is correct, *päst* in this passage is rather to be taken in its intensifying function: *(ṣärma)meṃ cai āntsi päst yelṣalyi* "for this r(eason) one has to investigate these elements thoroughly". ETYM. If the meaning '± investigate' is correct and if the root has to be set up as *yel-* with Prs VIII (and not as *yels-* or even *yelp-* with Prs II), the root may be derived from PIE *√u̯el 'sehen' (²LIV, 675 without Toch.; as verbal root otherwise only attested in Celtic); see Adams, DoT, 507. However, an *ē*-grade root allomorph PT *u̯ēl- would be quite odd in an *s*-present.

yok- 'trinken', 'drink' (tr) (a+/a/a)

      Prs I (a+) -, *yokt, yokäṃ;* — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part *yokamane*
           Ger I *yokalle* Abstr I —
      Sub I (a) *yoku,-, yokäṃ;-,-, yokäṃ* Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II *yokalyñe* Priv —
           Inf *yoktsi*
      Pt VI (?) (a) -,-, *yaśa-c/yāś;* —
      PPt *yāku| yākoṣ*
      Ipv —

The 1.sg. *yoku-c* in 241 b 2 and the 3.sg. *yokäṃ* in PK NS 95 b 1 are subjunctives (Pinault, 2000, 82; 2008, 346). The 2.sg. Prs *yokt* is attested in SI P/65 b 3 (Schmidt, 1997a, 260; Pinault, 2002, 314), the 3.pl. Prs *yokäṃ* in W 33 a 6 (see Schmidt, 1997, 249 and Schmidt, 1997a, 260, where he analyzes the form as a present), the Abstr *(yo)[k]alyñem[e](ṃ)* in KVāc 10 b 1 (Schmidt, 1986, 43). According to Schmidt, 1997a, 258ff., a 3.sg. Pt VI *yaśa-c* is attested in 250 a 2, and, in addition, a 2. or 3.sg. Pt VI *yāś* in H add.149 88 a 3 (it is certainly Schmidt's and not Broomhead's [I, 249] reading that is the correct one, cf. now Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 214): //// *(tu)sa yā[ś] yasar mīsa kektseñmeṃ allok pre(ścyaine)* //// "... trankest du [bzw. trank er] das aus Fleisch [und] Körper [strömende] Blut". However, according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c., *yāś* in the metrical passage IOL Toch 214 a 3 may stand for *yāśi*, possibly an Imp: "therefore he absorbed (?) blood and flesh from the body at another time" (one cannot coordinate flesh and body, whereas flesh and blood form a phrase). The text 250 is, on the other hand, philologically very difficult. The form *[yo]ku* attested in PK NS 58 b 2 (first published by Lévi/Meillet, 1912, 23, with the reading *yok*; see now Pinault, 1994, 136ff.) was analyzed as PPt by Thomas, 1986, 129f., because of the preceding form *śū*, which was itself analyzed as PPt by Sieg and consequently restored to *(śe)śū*. Differently, Pinault, 1994, 145f., takes the reading *śū* seriously and analyzes it as 1.sg. Sub, and consequently he also analyzes *[yo]ku* that way. On the genuine PPt from this root (attested five times), see Peyrot, 2007a, 799.

= *Ayok-* 'trinken', 'drink' (tr) (—)

      Prs I — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —

          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf *yoktsi*
      Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

^{A}*tsuk-* 'drink' provides the suppletive subjunctive, preterit, PPt, and imperative stems. According to TEB I, 230, § 412,6, the form TA *yoka[t]* in A 96 a 4 may be an analogical subjunctive (instead of expected *tsokat); Couvreur, 1956, 79, analyzes the form as a Prs by the meaning 'be thirsty', but the verb has otherwise the meaning 'drink'. To be sure, a present by the meaning 'drink' does not make much sense in A 96 a 4, while a subjunctive of ^{A}*yuk^ä-* 'overcome' does; see s.v. ^{A}*yuk^ä-*.

ETYM. Certainly to be derived from PIE *√$h_1eg^{ʷh}$ 'trinken' (^{2}LIV, 231), the root structure of which is the topic of some debate. The initial TB *y-* points to a preform *$ēk^ʷ$-, which may either be a Narten form (thus Pinault, 1994, 181; Weiss, 1994, 92, fn. 5) or the result of a reduplicated PIE present's zero grade *h_1e-$h_1k^ʷ$- (thus Eichner, 1973, 82, followed by Schmidt, 1997a, 260f.). The *o*-vocalism in the root is due to *u*-umlaut: *$ēk^ʷäC$- etc. > Early PT **yæku*C- etc. > *yokuC-; see chap. Sound Laws 1.6. Kim, 2000, 155ff. sets up the PIE root as *√$h_1eh_2g^{ʷh}$, which formed a Narten present *$(h_1)ēh_2g^{ʷh}$-/$(h_1)eh_2g^{ʷh}$- > *$ēg^{ʷh}$-/$āg^{ʷh}$- > PT **yæk*ʷ-/**åk*ʷ-, and derives the attested forms from the PT paradigm via mutual analogy; but see most recently Kloekhorst, 2008, 237 on the Anatolian comparanda. The TB preterit form *yāś* is derived by Schmidt, 1997a, 261 from a PIE perfect 3.sg. *h_1e-$h_1ok^ʷ$-e, this scholar being basically followed by Widmer, 2001, 188ff., who sets up *$h_1eh_1ŏg^{ʷh}$-e. Differently, Kim, 2000, 156, fn. 13 derives the preterit from a PIE thematic root aorist, and similarly Peters, 2004, 434. fn. 24: "doch kann B *yaś* 'er trank' sehr gut einen *schwundstufigen* "themat." Aorist *$h_1g^{ʷh}$-e-(t) fortsetzen". Finally, Ringe, apud Kim, 2000, 156 suggests that *yāś* may show an analogical zero grade to **yok*ʷ- (cf. the ablaut *o-/ā-* met in the antigrundverb from *ār$^{(ä)}$-* 'cease').

^{A}**yom$^{(ä)}$-** 'achieve, reach' → *yänm$^{(ä)}$-* 'id.'

yaukk^ä- 'anwenden, verwenden', 'use' (tr) (m/m/m)
      Prs IX (m) -,-, *yaukkastär* (sic, M); — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub V (m) —;-,-, *yaukkantär* Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II *yaukkalñe* Priv —
          Inf —
    Pt I (m) -,-, *yaukkāte-ne*; —
    PPt *yayaukkaṣ*
    Ipv —

For the present stem, see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.4.1 with fn. 4. The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. For the two glosses PPt *yayaukaṣ* and *yayaukkaṣ* attested in M 158.1 (= site mark signature), see now SHT 7, 1738 and Schmidt, 1990, 475.

ykāṃṣ-ᵃññ- 'Abscheu empfinden', 'feel disgust' (itr) (m/-/-)

    Prs XII (m) -, *ykaṃṣantar* (MQ), *ykāṃṣantär*;

        -,-, *ykāṃṣñentär/ykāṃṣäṃññentär* (sic) Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub XII — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *ykāṃṣälñe* (sic) Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

The 2.sg. Prs *ykamṣantar* is attested in the small fragment THT 1621 frg. b a 3 (MQ): • *kwipentar twe ykaṃṣanta[r] ////* "you feel ashamed [and] disgusted". Eтүм. Certainly a denominative; see Hilmarsson, 1991a, 84f.; Adams, DoT, 515.

TA *ypa-* → ᴬ*ya(p)-* 'do'

R

rāpˢ- 'graben, pflügen', 'dig, plow' (tr) (x/a/-)

    Prs VI (x) -,-, *rapanaṃ*; — | -,-, *rapanatär*; — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V (a) -,-, *rāpaṃ*; — Opt -,-, *rāpoy*; —
        Ger II — Abstr II *rapālñe* (sic) Priv —
        Inf *rāpatsi*
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

The middle 3.pl. Prs *rapanatär* (arguably non-passive) is attested in THT 3998 a 1, and the same (non-passive) form should also be restored in THT 1170 frg. a b 2: //// *(ra)panatṛa witsa(k)[ai] ////* "(d)igs up the root". The 3.sg. Sub *rāpaṃ* is found in H 149.296 a 4: *[w]itskaṃ ceṃ ḳᵤse tu [rā](paṃ)* "he who should dig up these roots" (Broomhead I, 133f.). Pace WTG, 277, *rapaññe* is not an abstract, but an adjective in *-ññe* (cf. *rapaññe meṃne*, the designation of the twelfth month); see Pinault, 2008, 363f. The genuine Abstr *[rapā](l)[ñe]* can be found in PK NS 53 a 5 (Pinault, 1988, 100 and 106; the text does not

have MQ character, the reading is certain), so we have to accept that there is initial accent in the Inf and non-initial accent in the Abstr.

~ *ᴬräpᵃ-* 'graben, pflügen', 'dig, plow' (tr) (-/-/a)

> Prs V — Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
>> Inf *rpātsi*
> Sub V — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II *rāplune*
> Pt I (a) -,-, *rāp;*—
> PPt *rārpu*
> Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs TA *rpeñc* in A 318 a 6 rather belongs together with TA *rape* 'music' and TA *rāpänt-* 'musician', as per TG, 461, fn. 1; see s.v. *ᴬräp?-* 'make music'. The Abstr TA *rāpl[u]ne* is attested in the gloss TA *[sa]rk rāpl[u]neyaśälä* in SHT 6, 1432 (a reading and translation different from that in SHT is given by K. T. Schmidt apud SWTF, s.v. *kulapāta*: "zusammen mit dem Ausgraben [dem Mit-der-Wurzel-Herausreißen, d.i. der Vernichtung] des Geschlechtes [der Familie]"). Eᴛʏᴍ. According to Adams, DoT, 528f., the root is related to "Proto-Anatolian *terep- < *trep-" denoting 'plow' said to come from PIE *√drep 'scratch, tear', but note that ²LIV, 650 derives the Anatolian comparanda from PIE *√trep 'wenden' (as also did Janda, 1997, 8ff. and most recently Kloekhorst, 2008, 871), from which Toch. *rāpᵃ-* cannot be derived by sound law.

rāmⁱ⁾- 'vergleichen', 'compare' (tr) (-/-/m)

> Prs — Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
> Sub — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
>> Inf —
> Pt I (m) -,-, *rāmate* (S);—
> PPt —
> Ipv —

Hapax in 107 a 2; on the passage, see Schmidt, 2008a, 322 and Pinault, 2008, 123.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ IV 'vergleichen lassen', 'let compare' (tr) (a/-/-)

> Prs IXb (a) -,-, *ramäṣṣäṃn-me* (sic);— Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
> Sub — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

            Inf —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *ramäṣṣäṃn-me* is attested in PK Cp 36, 43: "let us compare" (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

räk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich hinbreiten', 'extend oneself (over)' (itr) (-/m/-)
      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub V (m) — Opt —;-,-, *rākoyentär-ñ* (Š)
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt I in
      PPt *rarākau*
      Ipv —

The subjunctive stem seems to have persistent initial accent and persistent full vowel in the root, which is in accordance with the formation of the PPt that presupposes a Pt I of Subclass 5 **rākā-.*

Antigrundverb 'hinbreiten, bedecken', 'extend (over), cover' (tr) (a+/a/x)
      Prs VIII (a+) *raksau*,-,-; — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *räksemane*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub I — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf *raktsi*
      Sub II (a) -,-, *rāśäṃ* (MQ); — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt III (x) -,-, *reksa-me*; — | *räksāmai* (MQ),-, *raksate*; —
      PPt *reraku/rerakoṣ*
      Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *rakṣäṃ* listed in TEB I, 175, § 299,1c is probably only reconstructed. The existence of a 3.sg. Sub II *rāśäṃ* has been questioned, but see discussion of the two attestations in Hackstein, 1995, 118ff., who claimed -*ā*- has been introduced secondarily from the stem allomorph *rākā*- of the grundverb. Hackstein correctly sets up two subjunctive stems, Sub II for *rāśäṃ* and Sub I for the Inf *raktsi*; the latter form is so far only attested in the substantivized meaning 'cover, sitting rug' and is likely to be an archaism. Pace the manuals, M. Peyrot (p.c.) proposes to restore the alleged 1.sg. Pt *räkwā* in 339 a 6 (MQ) to a fem.pl. PPt *(re)räkwā*. The nom.sg. *reraku* is attested in THT 1387 frg. b b 2 (M. Peyrot, p.c.; cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). A PPt *rera(koṣäṃ)* is restored in 563 b 8 by TochSprR(B).

= ᴬ*räk?-* 'hinbreiten, bedecken', 'extend (over), cover' (tr) (-/-/a)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt III (a) -,-, *raksā-ṃ;-,-, rakär*
    PPt *rarku*
    Ipv —

SEM. The grundverb is expected to be intransitive, but the valency of *rākoyentär-ñ* in 271 a 1, which is the only attestation of a finite grundverb form, is difficult to determine. Marggraf, 1970, 30 takes the form to be transitive for the only reason that it has initial accent. On the other hand, the translation and interpretation of the passage by Schmidt, 1974, 276 is superior to that by Marggraf: *(ke)ktseñi rākoyentär-ñ painene po pūdñäktemts* "Die ... Körper aller Buddhas möchten sich zu meinen Füssen hinbreiten". Hackstein, 1995, 118 with fn. 29 adopts this translation of the form as direct-reflexive middle. Given that a grundverb with A-character correlated with an *ā*-less antigrundverb is generally intransitive, I also interpret the form as intransitive and the suffixed pronoun as an indirect object; in any case, the initial accent of the form cannot have anything to do with valency; see chap. Sub I/V 18.2.4. ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√h₃reĝ 'gerade richten, ausstrecken' (²LIV, 304f.); see Hackstein, 1995, 120f. and Adams, DoT, 529f. Since this root is known for Narten behavior, Sub II (of the antigrundverb) *rāśäṃ* may reflect an *ō*-grade perfect.

räṅk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'aufsteigen, besteigen', 'ascend, mount, climb up' (itr) (-/-/a)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V — Opt —
        Ger II *raṅkalle* Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf *raṅkatsi* (MQ)/ *räṅkatsi* (MQ)
    Pt I (a) -,-, *raṅka;-, raṅkas, räṅkāre* (MQ)
    PPt *räṅkau* (MQ) | *räṅkormeṃ*
    Ipv —

In the lacuna of 310 a 3, a 3.sg. Prs from this root may be restored with some certainty judging by the Skt. equivalent (see TochSprR(B), s.v.); however, the kind of stem formations will have to remain unknown. The Ger *raṅkal(l)e* or Abstr *raṅkal(ñ)e* in 355 a 6 (M) shows that we have a subjunctive with persistent initial accent. The 3.sg. Pt *raṅka* is attested in PK AS 17K b 5 (Bernhard, 1958, 100 with ref. to an older signature), the MQ form *raṅka* in 338 a 4. Beside the Abs *räṅkormeṃ*, a PPt *räṅkau* can be found in PK AS 12E a 5

(MQ, unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; already cited by Thomas, 1968a, 214 without signature).

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'aufsteigen', 'ascend' (tr) (a/-/a)

        Prs VIII (a) -,-, *raṅkṣäṃ;* — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub I — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *raṃktsi*
        Pt III (a) —;-,-, *reṅkare*
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *raṅksäṃ* is attested in THT 1459 b [recte a] 3, edited by Thomas, 1987, 170 without signature. According to Thomas, 1987, 177, a Ger I *(rä)ṅkṣalle* is further to be restored in H 149.333 a 4 (instead of *(tsä)ṅkṣalle* preferred by WTG, 306), but this is uncertain. The Inf *raṃktsi* attests to a Sub I and cannot be a depalatalized Inf to a Sub II; see the discussion in chap. Sub I/V 18.1.2.2. The 3.pl. Pt *reṅkare* is attested in PK AS 16.1 a 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; already listed in TEB II, 231 without ref.).

SEM. The basic meaning seems to be 'ascend', but in many passages the actual meaning of the forms is difficult to determine. *raṅksäṃ* in the above-mentioned Pātayantatika text is the equivalent of Skt. *adhi* √sthā, but the respective passages in the Sanskrit and Pāli versions are not too clear either; see the discussion by Thomas, 1987, 175ff. Adams, DoT, 530 assumes the antigrundverb could have a meaning 'take control of'. Since this is a verb of motion, the obliquus found with some forms from this root can be explained as obliquus of direction. ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√reng 'raise', as per Adams, DoT, 530.

^Arät²- '?' (?) (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt III in
        PPt *rartu*
        Ipv —

Unclear hapax without context in the small fragment A 459 a 2.

rätk^{ā?}- '± entstehen, (er)wachsen', '± come into being, (a)rise' (itr) (a/-/-)

        Prs VII (a) —;-,-, *rättaṅkeṃ* Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

Pinault, 1988, 111f. discusses the possibility of restoring a PPt *(r)ätkau* in PK NS 53 b 5, but in the end rather opts for *(s)ätkau* (differently, Adams, DoT, 531).

= ^A*rätk^?-* '± (er)heben', '± cause to arise, raise' (?) (—)

        Prs VIII — Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part *ritkäsmāṃ*

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt III in

        PPt *rarätku| raritku*

        Ipv —

SEM. The TB root must have A-character, since Prs VII is always associated with A-character. The above-mentioned TA forms lacking A-character could be assigned to a respective kausativum paradigm, but the equation of the TB and TA roots is a matter of discussion. 3.pl. Prs *rättaṅkeṃ* is a hapax in 17 b 3: *curṇanmasa ṣälypentasa nano mīsa rättaṅkeṃ* "(wenn ich mit dem Schwert eine Wunde am Körper mache), entsteht durch Pulver und Salben das Fleisch wieder" (TochSprR(B), transl., 25). However, Adams, DoT, 531 preferred to translate "[his] flesh heals again" and thought there were synchronically two different roots in Tocharian A, ^A*rätk-* 'heal' and ^A*ritk-* 'cause to arise, raise' (given up in ²DoT, s.v. *rätk-* '± heal, renew'). The Old Turkish parallel MaitrHami (X) 8, 1 (for which see Pinault, 1999, 199) assures that TA *rarätku* in the passage A 299 a 2 *tsälpāluneṣiṃ kuśalamūlyo rarätkuṣ* indeed means 'evoked', not 'healed', cf. the Old Turkish parallel version: "durch die Kraft der guten Wurzel der Erlösung steigen jene [...] herab zur Erde" (as translated by Geng/Klimkeit/Laut, 1987, 372); we clearly have to do with (a)rising rather than with healing. In A 291 a 2 the translation 'healed' is completely excluded, because the PPt refers to Maitreya: //// *(tsopatsäṃ karuṇyo) rarätku träṅkäṣ* "(Le Buddha Maitreya...) mis en mouvement par sa grande compassion, dit"; see Pinault, 1999, 206f. (Pinault sets up the root meaning as 'mettre en mouvement, inspirer, exciter'). The *i*-variant TA *raritku* is found in A 384 b 3 *saṃjñiṣiṃ wäntyo raritku wlesum*, which translates Skt. *saṃjñānilodutavṛtti-*

"dessen Verhalten durch den Bewußtheitswind hervorgerufen ist" (see TEB II, 144 s.v. *-wlesum*). The attestation of the *m*-Part TA *ritkäsmāṃ* in A 146 a 3 is not all together clear. All in all, there evidently was just one single root involved, which had the basic meaning '(a)rise', as per Melchert, 1978, 120. For the variation *-ä-/-i-*, Melchert aptly pointed to the same kind of variation found with TA *litk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'remove' (for which there is attested a variant *lätk-* by TA *lätkoräṣ*). With respect to the latter root, it hardly would make sense to claim that *-ä-* was the lautgesetzlich, and *-i-* an analogical outcome of pre-PT *-i-*, since the result of pre-PT *liC- by sound law was TB/TA *lyäC-*, and not *läC-*. Accordingly, it is best to follow the suggestion by Melchert, l.c., i.e., to assume that PT *r/läytk- could (at least sporadically) turn into *r/lätk-*. For the etymology, see again Melchert, l.c.

ᴬräp⁷- '± musizieren, spielen', '± make music, play' (tr) (a/-/-)

        Prs II (a) —;-,-, *rpeñc* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs TA *rpeñc* in A 318 a 6 is a cognate of TA *rape* 'music' and of TA *rā(pä)ntāñ* 'musicians', as per TG, 461, fn. 1: *ṣomaṃ nu rpeñc kispar wic ṣomaṃ tsärk* //// "some (women) play *kispar wic*, some lute …" (*kispar* is a hapax, *wic* may be *wic* 'magic', if the words are to be separated that way at all). The root ablaut is reminiscent of that met with *ᴬpikᵃ-* 'paint, write', where TA *pekant* 'painter', obl.sg. TA *pekäntāṃ*, and TA *peke* 'painting' are found beside the Class I present stem TA *pik-* and the Sub V stem TA *pekā-*. Likewise *ᴬtsip⁷-* 'dance' has an *nt*-nomen agentis nom.pl. TA *tsepäntāñ* 'dancer' and a Prs I TA *tsip⁷-*. Note that a Sub V stem *rāpā-* 'make music' would have been homonymous with the Sub V/Pt I stem TA *rāpā-* 'dig, plow' (see *ᴬräpᵃ-* 'dig, plow').

ᴬräpᵃ- 'dig, plow' → *rāpᵃ-* 'id.'

räm- '?' (?)

        Prs/Sub I/II (m) -,-, *ramtär-ñ*; — Imp/Opt —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

WTG, 126, § 122, fn. 3 analyzes isolated • *rämtä(r)////* in 365 b 4 (MQ) as Sub II form of *räm^a-* 'bend', which could indeed theoretically belong to an antigrundverb from that root; however, we now seem to have a second attestation of such a form that does not strongly support a meaning 'bend': THT 1335 frg. a b 5 //// *k̮ᵤri ñaś꞉ pläskau • ramṯar-ñ palsko snai* //// "if I think. The mind ... me without". That isolated *rämttär* or rather *rämntär* in the small fragment 147, frg. 5 b also belongs here is quite uncertain (Thomas, 1983, 12, fn. 14 connected it with *räm^a-* 'bend', and note that this otherwise isolated form indeed seems to be construed with an allative). For *-mt-* > *-mnt-*, see Peyrot, 2008, 156. Since all attestations are semantically unclear, I set up a special lemma for the root for the time being.

räm^a- 'sich neigen, sich verbeugen', 'bend, bow' (itr) (a/x/m)

> Prs VI (a) — Imp —;-,-, *rämnoyeṃ* (MQ)
> > nt-Part —
> > m-Part —
> > Ger I — Abstr I —
> Sub V (x) —;-,-, *rmantär* (MQ) Opt —;-,-, *ramoṃ | -,-, rmoytär;* —
> > Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
> > Inf —
> Pt I (m) -,-, *rämāte;* —
> PPt —
> Ipv —

Pace WTG, 278, *rmamñe* is not to be analyzed as an Abstr of this root (see TEB II, "Berichtigungen", 264). On *rämtä(r)* in 365 b 4 and *rämntär* in 147 frg. 5 b, see s.v. *räm-* '?'.

= ^A**räm^a-** 'sich neigen, sich verbeugen', 'neigen', 'bend (itr/tr), bow (itr/tr)'

> (itr/tr) (a/-/-)
> Prs VI (a) —;-,-, *rämneñc* Imp —
> > nt-Part —
> > m-Part —
> > Ger I — Abstr I —
> > Inf —
> Sub — Opt —
> > Ger II — Abstr II —
> Pt I in
> PPt in *rmoräṣ*
> Ipv —

SEM. In TA, the root is attested four times: A 11 a 1, A 159 a 2, A 174 a 6, YQ 19 a 8, and in all passages it co-occurs with TA *tkaṃ* 'towards the ground'; in TB, only two out of a total of six (clear) attestations show a corresponding construction with *keṃ* or an obliquus of direction: 33 b 4 and 246 a 3, according to the interpretation of *keṃ ññi* by Winter, 1962, 119 = 1984, 136f. = 2005, 77. The synonymous root *näm-/^Anäm^(a)-* 'bend, bow (tr/itr)' is, in contrast, usually construed with an allative, though an obliquus of direction is attested for this root as well: A 159 a 2 *sundarinac tkaṃ rmoräṣ* "having

bowed low towards the ground before Sundarī". Schmidt, 1974, 302 interprets *rämoytär* in 407 b 1 as a transitive form: *kaccap su no tälaṣṣi aśco rämoytär <r>mer* "erhöbe die Schildkröte den Kopf [and] zöge [ihn] gleich wieder ein [wtl. beugte [ihn] gleich wieder]". But I do not see why this transitive interpretation should be preferable to the intransitive one dismissed by Schmidt: "beugte sich gleich wieder", because there is apparently no enclitic pronoun after *rämoytär*, and one may doubt that *aśco* could be taken as a complement of both verbal forms. Even more problematic is the construction with *kwipe* 'shame', which resulted in a phrase with the meaning "sich der Scham beugen", as per Schmidt, l.c.: 81 a 3f. *päst mā kwīpe rmoytär* "(von einem Weisen soll eher der Tod hingenommen werden), [als daß] er sich der Schande beugte". Similarly, Krause, 1971, 42, but differently, Thomas, apud ²TochSprR(B), 236: "nicht soll das Scham[gefühl] weg[fort]gebeugt werden" = "als daß das Scham[gefühl] [...] unterdrückt würde" (similarly Krause, 1955, 42; objections to Thomas, l.c., are in turn raised by Schmidt/Strunk, 1989, 261 with fn. 27 and Schmidt, 2001, 310). A similar construction is attested in 255 b 7: *ce pi<ś> śaiṣṣe ālyinträ ñyātse kwipe rmantär mai* "Diese fünf sollen [zwar] die Welt fernhalten, müssen sich aber der Not [and] Scham beugen" (Schmidt/Strunk, 1989, 261f.; but on *alyintär*, see rather s.v. *āl⁽ᵃ⁾-* '± be restrained'); evidently an intransitive middle is here construed with an obliquus of direction. According to Schmidt, 1974, 302, fn. 1, transitive valency is found in A 10 b 6/11 a 1: *mrāc tkaṃ rmoräṣ* "den Scheitel zur Erde gebeugt habend". ETYM. The etymological connection of the root with PIE *√remH 'ruhen, sich stützen auf' (Hackstein, 1995, 22 with fn. 22; ²LIV, 252f. *√h₁rem 'ruhig werden') is not very convincing with respect to its semantics. According to Melchert (apud Adams, DoT, 531f.), the Sub V and Pt I forms from this root were secondary creations based on the Prs VI which in his view had started out as a nasal present to the root *näm-* of the same meaning, and then had undergone dissimilation of *nämn-* to *rämn-*. At any rate, both ᴬᴮ*räm^ä-* and *näm-*/ᴬ*näm⁽ᵃ⁾-* seem to be causative alternation roots, so that an intransitive use of the middle forms was precisely to be expected; what comes as a surprise is that the active forms of the Prs VI from ᴬᴮ*räm^ä-* have intransitive semantics in both Tocharian languages as well, and this strange behavior of ᴬᴮ*räm^ä-* is strongly reminiscent of the intransitive valency shown by TA 3.pl.act. Prs VIII *nämseñc* from ᴬ*näm⁽ᵃ⁾-* on the one hand and by active forms from nasal presents of other branches (such as Greek φθίνω 'decay, wane') on the other hand.

räs- '± ermahnen, erinnern', '± prompt, remind, admonish' (?) (—)

Prs IX — Imp —
  nt-Part —
  m-Part —
  Ger I *rsäṣṣälle* (MQ) Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —
  Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
  Inf —

Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

Hapax in 316 a 4: *(wi) tärya rsäṣṣä(lle)*; according to TochSprR(B), the passage
deals with Niḥs.Pāt. 10. The Pāli version reads *dvittikkhattuṃ codetabbo
sāretabbo*, cf. Norman, 2001, 34f.: "prompting and reminding two or three
times", so the manuals usually equate *rsäṣṣä(lle)* with Pāli *codetabbo* 'to be
prompted' and therefore set up the meaning of the root as 'antreiben' (WTG,
278, naming as a possible cognate *rser* 'hate'). The Sanskrit version of
Niḥs.Pāt. 10 reads *dvis triś codayitavyaḥ smārayitavyaḥ* "soll er [...] zwei, drei
Mal mahnen and erinnern", cf. von Simson, 2000, 190 (text), 284 (trans.), so
that the meaning of the root is indeed to be set up as '± prompt, remind,
admonish'. We are most likely dealing with a Prs IXa, since one would not
expect an *ä carrying the accent to be lost, although such a loss is indeed
attested sporadically, but mostly in metrical texts, and this is a prose text.

räs[?]- 'ausstrecken, recken', 'stretch (out)' (tr) (a/-/-)
        Prs V/XII (a) -,-, *rsaṃ* (MQ); — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I in
        PPt in *rsormeṃ*
        Ipv —

The Abs *rsormeṃ* is attested in PK AS 15A + NS 350 a 3 (unpublished,
reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The present stem is usually taken to
be a Prs V, but note that this analysis would require a persistent root vowel *ä,
which is not so trivial an assumption. On the other hand, Adams, DoT, 532
correctly pointed out that *rsaṃ* can also be interpreted as a Prs XII form, and
this analysis gets support from the Prs VI that is found with the TA cognate of
the root — actually, a Prs XII is also found to exist beside a Prs VI in the case
of the root *mänt*[(a)]- 'stir, destroy'.

= [A]*räs*- 'ausstrecken, recken', 'stretch (out)' (tr) (a/a/-)
        Prs VI (a) — Imp -,-, *räsñā*; —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub V (a) -,-, *rasaṣ*; — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I in
        PPt in *rsoräṣ*
        Ipv —

TG, 462 proposes that //// *rsoss* in A 278 a 8 may be a (nom.sg. fem.) PPt form of this root, followed by Pinault, 1994c, 387, who refers to the Old Turkish parallel version, which reads in translation: "Wie den Geschmack des Lebenselixiers (*amr̥ta*) ausstreuend". However, since *räs^ä*- in both languages has always the object 'arms' (cf. also the derived noun and unit of measurement *raso* 'span'), one should perhaps better restore TA *(pä)rsos* 'sprinkled' from ^A*pärs^(ä)*- 'sprinkle, spray'.

ETYM. Quite unclear; see the various suggestions in Adams, DoT, 532.

räsk- '± würzen (?)', '± spice (?)' (?) (−)

   Prs IXb — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I *raskäṣlona* Abstr I —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —

Hapax in Fill. Y 1 b 4 according to the reading of Couvreur, 1954, 84, which is now confirmed by Carling, 2003, 40 with fn. 24. (p. 43): *toy saṃtkenta raskäṣlona* "diese Heilmittel sind zu ... (und darüber ist Saindhava-Salz als feines Pulver zu tun", cf. also Sieg, 1955, 65, who had there read a form *raswäṣlona* from the root *räss^(ä)*- 'herausreißen'. According to Carling, 2003a, 50f. and Pinault, in print, we are rather dealing with a root *räsk-* 'rendre amer, saler', to which the adj. *räskare* 'hot, spicy, bitter' belongs as well.

^A**räsw^ä-** 'tear, pick' → *räss^(ä)*- 'id.'

räss^(ä)- 'herausreißen, pflücken', 'tear, pick' (tr) (x/-/x)

   Prs II (x) -,-, *räṣṣiṃ* (sic); — Imp —;-,-, *räṣṣiyeṃ* | —;-,-, *räṣyentär*
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub V — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II *rassalñe* (sic) Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt I (x) —;-,-, *rässāre* | -,-, *rässāte*; —
   PPt —
   Ipv —

Instead of a Ger *raswäṣlona* built from this root, one has to read *raskäṣlona* in Fill. Y 1 b 4, according to Couvreur, 1954, 84 and Carling, 2003, 40 (see s.v. *räsk-* '± spice'). The Abstr *rassalñe* is to be read in K 3 (= PK AS 7C) b 2, according to Pinault, 2007, 210 and contra TEB II, 68, No. XXV, 9. Since K 3 does not seem to be an MQ text, we have to do with a subjunctive with

persistent initial accent. Sub V and A-character are to be assumed for TA, and also suggested for TB by the fact that the preterit would have been expected to show stem-final palatalization if it was affiliated with a subjunctive stem of Class II. The 3.sg.mid. Pt *rässāte* is attested in PK LC XI a 2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

= ᴬ*räsw*ᵃ- 'herausreißen, pflücken', 'tear, pick' (tr) (-/-/m)

        Prs VI — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *rsunāmāṃ*
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *rsunātsi*
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I (m) -,-, *räswāt*, —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The Abstr TA *räswālune* listed in TEB II, 133 is merely based on a form in A 67 a 4 that was as a whole restored by TEB II, 28, no. III, 44. However, a subjunctive stem of Class V seems obvious. TG, 463 proposes to restore a 3.pl.act. Pt TA *(ra)swar* in A 155 b 2: *(ra)swar täm śwāmāṃ kārāś katkar* "they pulled out ..., eating that they crossed the woods". Eᴛʏᴍ. A denominative to a noun in pre-PT *-u̯o- or *-u̯ā- (the Prs II met in Tocharian B possibly deriving from a formation in pre-PT *-u̯ei̯e/o-); as for a further diachronic analysis, it is tempting to see in the pre-PT noun in *-u̯o- a formation of the Gk. type ἴσος < *u̯id-s-u̯o-, i.e., a *-u̯o- derivative from the allomorph of an *s*-stem that consisted of zero grades only. As the root basic to such an *s*-stem, of course the one underlying ᴬᴮ*ru*ᵃ- 'pull out' seems to suggest itself; but since this root probably ended in a laryngeal, one would have to assume in addition that Schindler's *Wetter* rule had applied as well, i.e., that a *(H)ruH-s-u̯o- had been turned by that rule into a pre-PT *rusu̯o- (cf. the similar analysis I give for *mätsts*ᵃ-/ᴬ*nätsw*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'starve').

ᴬ*ri*- 'leave' → ᴬ*ri(-n)*- 'id.'

*riṅk*ᵃ- '?' (?) (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *riṅkatsi*
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Hapax in Fill. W 39 b 1: *malkwersa trīwäṣällya ṣpakīye [pilkwersa riṅkatsi sā ṣpakīye]* "sont à mélanger avec du lait: emplâtre; ... cet emplâtre avec ..."; see Filliozat, 1948, 88, and cf. Broomhead I, 38: "is to be mixed in milk. The pill to ... in pilkwer. This pill ..." Broomhead further comments: "The facsimile shows *pi[lk]wersa [r]iṅkatsi* almost clear. However both words appear to be hapax legomena, and the sense is not easy to imagine". Adams, DoT, 533 proposes '± apply'; as cogent as the connection by Adams, DoT, 387 of *pilkwer* with the root *pälk*(ᵃ)- 'burn' is, a meaning '± boil, carbuncle' and translation of the passage "a poultice over the boil [is] to be placed" is not too convincing in this context. In any case, the use of an infinitive instead of a gerundive is remarkable. If *pilkwer* is indeed a cognate of *pälk*(ᵃ)- 'burn', this word may refer to some kind of combustion residue "... is to be cooked in milk, the pill together with the cinder (?) is/has to ...". As for the morphology, we only can have to do with a subjunctive stem of Class V with (persistent) initial accent (unless one is prepared to take *riṅkatsi* as an erroneous spelling for **riṅkātsi*).

*rit*ᴮ- 'suchen, erstreben, (Wunsch) hegen', 'seek, long for, cherish (a wish)'
   (tr) (x/m/m)
   Prs VI (x) -,-, *ritanaṃ*; — | -,-, *ritanatär*; — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub V (m) *ritamar*,-, *rītatär*;-,-, *ritantär* Opt -,-, *rītoytär*; —
     Ger II *ritale* Abstr II *rītalñe* Priv —
     Inf *rītatsi*
   Pt I (m) -, *ritātai*, *rītāte*; —
   PPt *ritau* | *ritoṣ*
   Ipv I (m) *prītar*; *prītat*
The active Prs *(r)itanaṃ* is attested in an unpublished Berlin text, according to Thomas, 1979, 165 (if this is indeed a correct restoration — otherwise only middle forms are found from this root), the 3.sg.mid. Prs *ritanatär-ś* in a text kept by the Regional Museum of Ürümqi, according to Schmidt, 1997, 236f. The 1.sg. Sub *ritamar* is found quite often, the Opt *rītoytär* is also attested in THT 1274 a 2 and THT 2247 b 7. The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. TochSprR(B) proposes to further restore a 3.pl.mid. Pt *ri(tānte)* in 408 b 3. The obl. PPt *ritoṣ* is attested in 284 a 4 (*ritoṣ wändrentse* "of the thing longed for", cf. Couvreur, 1954c, 110).
= ᴬ*rit*ᴮ- 'suchen, erstreben, (Wunsch) hegen', 'seek, long for, cherish (a wish)'
   (tr) (m+/m/m)
   Prs VI (m+) -, *rinātār*, *rinātär*; — Imp —
     nt-Part *rināntāñ*
     m-Part *rināmāṃ*
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf *rinātsi*
   Sub V (m) *ritāmār*,-,-; *ritāmtär*,-,- Opt -,-, *rititär*; —

Ger II — Abstr II *ritālune*

Pt I (m) -,-, *ritāt, ritāmät*,-,-

PPt *rito*

Ipv I (m) *pritār*;-

The 1.sg. Pt TA *(ritā)mät* can be restored in A 270 a 5, according to Pinault, 1997, 125 contra TG, 457, where TA *(ypā)mät* was proposed. ETYM. On the evidence of the persistent initial accent found with the TB Sub V, *rit-* at least in this formation is best traced back to pre-PT *reit̯- (see chap. Sub I/V), but there is no obvious etymology for this *reit̯- available.

Aritk- → *Arätk?-* '± evoke'

ritt⁽ā⁾- 'verbunden sein, verharren', 'sich ziemen', 'be attached, linked to,
          persist', 'be suitable for' (itr) (m/m/a)
          Prs III (m) -,-, *rittetär, rittemntär* (S),-,- Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
          Sub V (m) -,-, *rittātär*; — Opt -,-, *rittoytär*; —
                    Ger II — Abstr II *rittālñe* Priv —
                    Inf —
          Pt I (a) *rittāwa*,-, *ritta*; —
          PPt *rittau/rittowo* | *rittoṣ*
          Ipv (x) -; *prittāso* | *pärrittar* (sic)/*rīttar, pärīttat*

A 3.sg. Prs *rettetär* (sic) from this root is arguably also attested in SHT 7, 1709 (reading according to K. T. Schmidt), and the 1.pl. Prs *rittemntär* not only in 108 a 8 (S), but also in PK Cp 32, 4 (Pinault, 1984a, 24; on the ending -*mntär*, see Peyrot, 2008, 158). The MQ form restored to a 2.sg. Pt *r(i)t(ta)sta* in 203 b 1 by TochSprR(B) is rather be restored to *[r](ai)[t](ta)sta*; see below. The 2.sg.mid Ipv *pärrittar* (sic) is attested in PK AS 15H b 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), and the 2.pl.mid. Ipv *pärīttat* in PK NS 38 + 37 b 3 (Pinault, 1988a, 194; 2008, 50).

KAUSATIVUM I 'verbinden, anpassen, übersetzen, sich anschicken', 'connect,
          adapt, translate, set about' (tr) (a+/-/x)
          Prs IXb (a+) *rittäskau/rittaske̬ᵤ* (MQ),-, *rittäṣṣäṃ*;-,-, *rittäskeṃ* Imp —
                    nt-Part *rittaṣṣeñca* (sic)
                    m-Part *rittäskemane*
                    Ger I *rittäṣälle* Abstr I —
          Sub IXb — Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                    Inf *rittästsi*
          Pt II (x) -, *raittasta*,-; — | -,-, *raittate*;-,-, *raittante*
          PPt *rerittu/rerītwa* | *rerittoṣ*
          Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs *rittäskeṃ* is attested in PK AS 17D a 4 (Pinault, 1994, 128) and in H add.149 88 a 2 (Broomhead I, 249), the *m*-Part *rittäskemane* in PK AS 16.1 a

2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). In 203 b 1 one should better restore a transitive 2.sg. Pt *[r](ai)[t](ta)sta* instead of an intransitive 2.sg. Pt: *onolm[e](ṃ) pern(e)[r]ñ(e)mpa [r](ai)[t](ta)sta* "you have attached the beings to splendor" (cf. Kölver, 1965, 64); differently Carling, 2003b, 65. The 3.sg.mid. Pt *raittate* is not only attested in the MQ text 339, but also in 527 b 4 (D). TochSprR(B) restores a 3.pl.mid. *(rai)[tt]ān[t]e* in 45 a 4, but since this form would show an unexpected accent, it is better to restore to a Pt I *(ri)[tt]ānte*, if we are dealing with a form of this root at all; the 3.pl. Pt *raittante* is attested in the small fragment H 149.add 37 a 4 (Broomhead I, 118).

= *ᴬritw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'verbunden sein, verharren', 'sich ziemen', 'be attached, linked to,
    persist', 'be suitable for' (itr) (m+/a/a)
    Prs III (m+) -,-, *ritwatär;-,-, ritwantär* Imp —
        nt-Part *ritwantāp*
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub V (a) —;-,-, *ritweñc* Opt —
        Ger II *ritwāl* Abstr II *ritwālune*
    Pt I (a) -,-, *ritu;*—
    PPt *ritwo*
    Ipv I (a) -; *pritwäs*

Active TA *ri(t)w(e)ñc* in A 220 a 2 can be present or subjunctive (cf. TG, 462), but since there exist no active present forms of Prs III/IV in TA at all, the form is better analyzed as Sub V.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'verbinden, übersetzen; erschaffen', 'connect, translate; create'
    (tr) (a/-/a)
    Prs VIII (a) -,-, *ritwäṣ;-,-, ritwseñc* Imp —
        nt-Part *ritwṣant*
        m-Part —
        Ger I *ritwṣäl* Abstr I —
        Inf *ritwässi*
    Sub IX — Opt —
        Ger II *ritwāṣäl* Abstr II *ritwāṣlune*
    Pt II (a) *raritwā,-, raritu/rarittwā-ṃ* (sic); —
    PPt *raritwu*
    Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. The meaning 'be suitable for' is, e.g., attested in the Prātimokṣa rule 331 b 3: *yatsi rittetär* "(in that case) it is suitable (for a monk) to go". For the meaning 'translate', see Sieg, 1937, 132ff., and Thomas, 1989, 9, who rather propose 'abfassen, verfassen, verfertigen' than 'translate'. The verb is also used with respect to creating graphic characters in A 273 a 3 (cf. the Old Turkish parallel MaitrHami (XI) 15 a 1 in Geng/Klimkeit/Laut, 1988, 359, and Pinault, in print a). The function of the middle forms of the antigrundverb is not clear (despite Schmidt, 1974, 323, 343, and 437). Eᴛʏᴍ. Evidently a denominative, but further connections are uncertain.

^Aritw^(a)- 'be attached' → *ritt^(a)-* 'id.'

ri-n- 'verlassen, aufgeben', 'leave, give up' (tr) (m+/m/m)

        Prs Xa (m+) -, *rinastar, rinastär; rinaskemntär* (S),-, *rinaskentär*

                Imp -,-, *rīnäṣṣitär* (MQ); —

                nt-Part *rinaṣṣeñca*

                m-Part —

                Ger I *rinaṣälle* Abstr I —

        Sub I (m) -, *rintar, rintär;* — Opt *riñīmar,-, riñitär;* —

                Ger II *rilye* Abstr II *rilñe* Priv —

                Inf *rintsi/ritsi*

        Pt III (m) *rintsamai, rintsatai/rinsatai, rintsate* (Š)/*rinsāte-ne* (Š);

                rīntsāmte (MQ),-, *rintsante*

        PPt *rerinu| rerinoṣ*

        Ipv III (m) *printsar/pritsar;-*

Thomas, apud ²TochSprR(B) restores a 1.sg.mid. Prs *(rinaske)mar* in 67 a 3. The 3.sg.mid. Imp *rīnäṣṣitṛa* (sic) is attested in THT 3597 b 3 (MQ, cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 273), the 1.pl.mid. Pt *rintsamai* in PK Cp 8 b 2 (Pinault, 1994b, 107; 2008, 372), and arguably also in THT 1573 frg. g b 1. The PPt *rerinoṣ* is found in 194 a 6 and PK AS 16.2 a 6 (Pinault, 1989a, 155). Instead of the Ipv from this root *prītsa* preferred by Thomas, 1969b, 58, fn. 24, Schmidt, 1990, 476 with fn. 21b rather wants to read *preksa* in M 153.2 a 4 (= SHT 7, 1704).

= *^Ari(-n)-* 'verlassen, aufgeben', 'leave, give up' (tr) (m+/m/m)

        Prs X (m+) -, *rinäṣtār, rinäṣtär;* — Imp —

                nt-Part *rimṣant*

                m-Part *rinäsmāṃ*

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf *rinässi*

        Sub VII (m) *riñmār, riñtār,-;-, riñcär,-* Opt -, *riñitār, riñitär;* —

                Ger II *riñäl* Abstr II *riñlune*

        Pt III (m) *rise, risāte, risāt;-,-, risānt*

        PPt *raryu*

        Ipv III (m) -; *prisāc*

Thomas, 1997, 110, fn. 203 proposes restoration of a 2.sg.mid. Prs TA *rinä(ṣtār)* in A 41 b 4. The *m*-Part TA *(rinä)smāṃ* is restored in A 15 a 4 by Sieg, Übers. I, 18. ETYM. Perhaps to be derived from a transitive nasal present PIE *Hri-néH/nH- from PIE *√HreiH 'durcheinanderwirbeln' (root shape and meaning according to Praust, 2000, 74) by a replacement of *-nH- by *-nu- (note that a *nu*-present is also attested in Slavic; see the ref. in ²LIV, 306, fn. 6); Adams, DoT, 536 even reckons with an inherited PIE *-nu- present. See also chap. Sub VII 22.2.2.

ru- '± despair' → *rew^{a?}-* 'id.'

ru- act. 'öffnen', 'open', mid. 'sich öffnen', 'open' (tr/itr) (m/x/-)

        Prs VIII (m) —;-,-, *rusentär* Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub I (a) (tr) -, *rewät*,-; *ruwäm* (MQ),-,- Opt *ruwim*,-,-;—

                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                Inf *rutsi*

        Sub III (m) (itr) — Opt —;-,-, *ruwyentär*

                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt III in

        PPt in *rerūwermeṃ*

        Ipv —

The 2.sg. Sub *rewät* is attested in PK AS 17A b 4f. (Pinault, 1984b, 169f.), so we are dealing with a subjunctive with persistent initial accent. Pace the manuals, the intransitive middle Opt *ruwyentär* is better analyzed as a Sub III stem formation; see chap. Sub III. The Abs *rerūwermeṃ* in 393 a 3 is without context, but can formally be built from a PPt *reru from an *s*-preterit of this root.

= ^A***ru-*** 'öffnen', 'open' (tr) (a/-/-)

        Prs VIII (a) —;-,-, *ruseñc* Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

TG, 463 analyzes TA *rwātsi* in A 311 b 6 as Inf from this root, but this form rather belongs to ^A*ruᵃ*- 'pull out', as was seen independently by Couvreur, 1956, 78 and Thomas, 1957, 152, fn. 7.

Sᴇᴍ. The active has transitive, the middle intransitive valency; see Hackstein, 1995, 77. Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from PIE *√reu̯H 'open' (set up by ²LIV, 510 as *√reu̯h₁); see Hackstein, 1995, 77ff.; Adams, DoT, 537. Differently, Schmidt, 2000a, 507ff. (PIE *√h₃u̯er).

ruᵃ- 'herausreißen', 'pull out' (tr) (m/-/-)

        Prs V (m) -,-, *rwātär*;— Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I *ruwāllona* Abstr I —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

        Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

rwātär is a gloss on Skt. *mūlacchid* "die Wurzeln abschneidend" in SHT 5, 1109; see Schmidt, 1990, 475. In theory, *rwātär* can be a TA form as well, and TA glosses are indeed otherwise found in Sanskrit texts from Murtuq (e.g., in SHT 5, 1030 and 1033), but since the same text also has a gloss *a[s](p)ā* //// on Skt. *ānejya* 'immovable, unshakable', which should be restored to a TB Priv *a[s](p)ā(watte)* (see Schmidt, 1990, 475; the form is also attested elsewhere; see Hilmarsson, 1991, 35f.), *rwātär* is most likely also a TB word.
= ^A***ru^ä-*** 'herausreißen', 'pull out' (tr) (—)

        Prs V — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *rwātsi*
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

The TA *rwātsi* in A 311 b 6 belongs to this root, as per Couvreur, 1956, 78 and Thomas, 1957, 152, fn. 7. Eᴛʏᴍ. From PIE *√reṷh₂/₃ 'ausgraben, herausreißen'; see Hackstein, 1995, 78 and Adams, DoT, 537 (²LIV, 510 sets up *√reṷH 'aufreißen'; but note fn. 1: "toch. *rwā-* spricht gegen *h₁*").

[***ruk?-*** '± gleam, shine'; TochSprR(B) proposed a restoration to *[ruk](ante)[c]* (with question mark) in 224 b 1: *[ruk](ante)[c] [lä]kts(i) eśän(e)* "es haben dir geglänzt" (cf. Sieg, apud Thomas, 1957, 175), but according to Schmidt, 2000, 226, one rather has to read and restore *ruk(ai)ṣa-c*, which he (p. 231) takes to be a 3.du. preterit from a root *ruk-* 'leuchten': *[ruk](ai)[sä]-c [lä]kts(i) eśän(e tä)ṅwäññane* "thy brilliant eyes gleamed with love" (cf. Adams, DoT, 537 and ²DoT, s.v. *¹ruk-*). The reading ⟨ṣa⟩ can be confirmed by the original manuscript; a restoration *[ruk](ante)[c]* is, in my opinion, indeed excluded. Since we are dealing with an MQ text with common archaic ductus, it is not a priori excluded that the dual ending *-ais* could show up with the final *-ä* one has to reconstruct still preserved. However, such a dual form following by enclitic *-cä* should rather have resulted in °*ais-cä*, which would also have consisted of two syllables. In addition, there is no other evidence for such a root; but note that Melchert, apud Adams, DoT, 537 suggested such a root might be a loan *ruk-* from an Iranian language, a zero-grade variant from PIE *√leṷk 'shine'. Finally, I would not altogether exclude the possibility

to restore another consonant above the akṣara ⟨k ⟩, so maybe we have rather to do with a stem *ru(ṅ)k-* vel sim.]

ruk^{B?}- 'abmagern', 'emaciate' (?) (−)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I in
        PPt *rukau*
        Ipv —
Hapax in 73 b 2.
= *^{A}ruk^{B?}-* 'abmagern', 'emaciate' (?) (−)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I in
        PPt *ruko*
        Ipv —
ETYM. A-character is presupposed by the PPt formation. Maybe a cognate of Lith. *runkù* 'shrivel', etc., cf. Adams, DoT, 537f. with ref. (not in ²LIV).

^{A}rut^{B?}- '?' (?) (−)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I in
        PPt *ruto*
        Ipv —
Unclear hapax in A 222 a 3: *sne-palṣīnäṃ rīteyo rutoṣ wrasa(s)* "the beings are *rutoṣ* in their non-dharma-like desire", for which a translation '± deluded' or similar would make some sense. A-character is presupposed by the formation of the PPt.

rutk^a̯- '(weg)bewegen, ablegen, ausziehen', '(re)move, take off, doff'
　　　(tr) (m/a/x)
　　　Prs VII (m) *ruttaṅkemar,-,-;* — Imp —
　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　m-Part —
　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
　　　Sub V (a) -,-, *rautkaṃ;* — Opt —
　　　　　Ger II — Abstr II *rutkalyñe* Priv —
　　　　　Inf *rutkatsi*
　　　Pt I (x) —;-,-, *rotkär-ne* (Š) | -,-, *rutkāte* (S); —
　　　PPt *rutkoṣ*
　　　Ipv —

The 1.sg.mid. Prs *ruttaṅkemar* listed in TEB I, 206, § 372 without ref. is attested without context in the small fragment THT 1131 frg. m a 1. The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. Probably *rutkaṃ* in THT 1309 b 3 (MQ) belongs here as well: //// *ś[l]e p̱alsko ramṯa rutkaṃ paiy(y)e* "as like the mind they remove (?) the foot". On the 3.pl. Pt *rotkär-ne*, see chap. Pt I 7.2.1.1.

= ^A***rutk^a̯-*** '(weg)bewegen, beseitigen', '(re)move' (tr) (m/-/a)
　　　Prs VII (m) *rutäṅkāmār,-,-; rutäṅkāmtär,-,-* Imp —
　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　m-Part —
　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
　　　　　Inf —
　　　Sub V — Opt —
　　　　　Ger II — Abstr II *rutkālune*
　　　Pt I (a) —;-,-, *rotkar*
　　　PPt *rutko*
　　　Ipv —

According to TG, 463, one can read TA *rutäṅkeñc-äṃ* in A 98 a 1 instead of *[t]ru säṅkeñcäṃ* (thus TochSprR(A)), but the context is unclear. Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 138 read a PPt from this root in YQ 43 a 1: TA *[r]utk(o) ākāṣ̱* "having moved (?) the sky". Differently, Schmidt, 1999b, 280 wants here to read TA *(ka)[k]la(ṃ) ākāṣ̱*. While reading the initial, damaged akṣara as *[k]ḻa* instead of *[r]u* is acceptable, I do not understand why Schmidt apparently omits the clearly visible akṣara ⟨tka⟩ between *[k]ḻa* and *ā*; he does not discuss what a form TA *(ka)[k]ḻa(ṃ)* should be in morphological terms either, and since a root ^A*klätk^a̯-* is further otherwise unattested, I rather accept the interpretation of Ji/Winter/Pinault. SEM./ETYM. According to Melchert, 1978, 124f., the root is to be derived from a PIE *-sk̂e/o- present *rud^h-sk̂e/o- from PIE *√reu̯d^h 'roden' (²LIV, 509, without Toch.). Despite Schmidt, 1974, 409, 412f. ("Das Objekt geht aus dem Bereich des Subjekts hinaus"), the middle inflection does not convey any special function.

re(-sk)- 'fließen', 'flow' (itr) (a/-/-)

         Prs II/IX (a) -,-, *reṣṣäṃ*;-,-, *reskeṃ* Imp —;-,-, *reṣyeṃ*

               nt-Part —

               m-Part *reskemane*

               Ger I — Abstr I —

         Sub — Opt —

               Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

               Inf —

         Pt —

         PPt —

         Ipv —

The *m*-Part *reskema[ne]* seems attested in THT 2243 a 3 without much context. The Imp *reṣyeṃ* is only listed in TEB II, 232 without ref. The manuals assume we have to do with a root *re-* forming a present stem of Class IX (see also Hackstein, 1995, 203), but Adams, DoT, 540 correctly points out that one might as well set up a root *resk-* forming a present stem of Class II. Without further forms of the paradigm available, the question cannot be decided.

rok- 'shine' → *pārāk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'prosper'

r(·)wᴮ?- '± verzagen; sich schämen', '± despair; be ashamed' (itr) (-/-/a)

         Prs — Imp —

               nt-Part —

               m-Part —

               Ger I — Abstr I —

         Sub — Opt —

               Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

               Inf —

         Pt I (a) -,-, *r(·)wa*; —

         PPt —

         Ipv —

Hapax in 46 a 1: *(rä)skre yāmu erkatte r(·)wₐ=attsaik päst snai maiyya* "heftig verärgert, verzagte (?) er ganz, der kraftlose"; see TochSprR(B), transl., 68. It is very likely that *r(·)wa* is a verbal form and more precisely a 3.sg. Pt, but the Pt I 3.sg. *rawa* from a root *ru-* 'verzagen (?)' restored by WTG, 280 cannot be a linguistically correct form. Adams, DoT, 537 rather restored to *r(ā)wa*, but what I see on the original manuscript does not support such a reading — actually, one should have expected some traces of the *ā*-grapheme still being visible after the lacuna. To judge by the lacuna, the most likely restoration would be *r(e)wa*, which would have to be taken for a monophthongized variant of a more original †*raiwa*.

*ᴬ****rsu-*** 'tear, pick' → *ᴬräswᵃ̊-* 'id.'

L

lare-ññ- 'lieben', 'love' (tr) (m/-/-)

      Prs XII (m) —;-,-, *lareññentär* Imp —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part —

          Ger I — Abstr I —

      Sub — Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

          Inf —

      Pt —

      PPt —

      Ipv —

Hapax in 245 b 3 (MQ): *(wä)ntärwa (no källā)tsiś kā lareññent* "why do they love to (acqui)re things?"; see Adams, DoT, 545. ETYM. Denominative ultimately built to the adj. *lāre* 'lovable'; see Hilmarsson, 1991a, 85 and Adams, DoT, 545.

lāṃs- 'verrichten, ausführen, erwirken, errichten', 'work on, perform,

      accomplish, build' (tr) (m/m/m)

      Prs II (m) -,-, *lāṃṣtär*;-,-, *laṃssemtär* (sic) Imp —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part —

          Ger I *laṃṣalle* Abstr I —

      Sub II (m) — Opt -,-, *laṃṣītär*; —

          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

          Inf *lāṃṣtsi/lāssi/lāṃssi*

      Pt I (m) *laṃṣāmai, laṃṣātai, laṃṣāte/laṃṣṣāte* (S);

          -,-, *laṃṣānte/laṃṣṣānte* (sic)

      PPt *lalāṃṣuwa| lalāṃṣaṣ* (sic)

      Ipv —

The 3.pl.mid. Prs *laṃssemtär* is attested in THT 1574 a 2 (published as no. XXXIV, 3 in TEB II, 74; see also Schmidt, 1974, 502), the Ger I *laṃṣalle* in PK Cp 36, 39 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 2.sg.mid. Pt *la[ṃ]ṣātai* in the graffito Qu 34 (Pinault, 1994a, 175 and 181; 2000a, 157), and the obl. PPt *lalāṃṣaṣ* in the letter PK LC XXI, 2: //// [ś]ātre lalāṃṣaṣ̱ tākaceṟ̱ "you (pl.) shall work on the grain" (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the ending *-aṣ* instead of expected *-oṣ* surely being due to a misspelling (i.e., omission of the *o*-sign). An Opt (or Imp) 3.sg.mid. *laṃṣī[t]rä* is arguably further found in the small fragment THT 1268 a 2, an (isolated) 1.sg.mid. Pt *laṃṣāmai* in THT 1392 frg. a b 2. For the meaning of the nom.pl. fem. *lalāṃṣuwa* in PK AS 18 B (= MSL 19, 160) a 2, see Thomas, 1987a, 87ff. with ref.; differently Schmidt, 1997, 234. The forms with geminated *-ss-/-ṣṣ-* come from eastern or informal texts. SEM. There are some passive forms (on which see Schmidt, 1974, 246f.), but the function of the middle is not always clear. ETYM. According to Adams, DoT, 546f., we are dealing with a

"derivative" of *lāṃs* 'work, service'. The root is certainly both an equivalent and a cognate of *ᴬwles-* 'perform, build, cultivate' (cf. the noun TA *wles*, which is an equivalent of TB *lāṃs* and no doubt even to be equated with it), but any further analysis is extremely speculative. (One could toy with the idea that the nouns *lāṃs*, TA *wles* 'work, service' go back to a PT *w(ä)lānt-sä from pre-PT *°su with the original semantics *'of one in control, of one capable', and the present/subjunctive stems to a denominative stem PT *w(ä)lāntsw'ä/æ- of the type Gk. θέρμω; for the loss of *-t- in a (pre-)TB cluster (*)-nts-, see s.v. *mān(t)s⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'be sorrowful'.)

lātkᵃ- 'abschneiden', 'cut off' (tr) (a/-/m)

       Prs VI (a) — Imp —;-,-, *latkanoyeñ-c*
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub V — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf *lātkatsi* (MQ)/*latkatsi* (MQ)
       Pt I (m) -, *lātkātai* (sic),-;-,-, *latkānte-c* (MQ)
       PPt —
       Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *latkanaṃ* listed in TEB I, 205, § 370,1 is probably only reconstructed, whereas the 2.sg.mid. Pt *lātkātai* listed in TEB II, 234 can be found in the very small fragment 344 frg. 4; the 3.pl. Pt *latkānte-c* is attested in the MQ text THT 3597 (= Mainz 655,1) b 7; this text is parallel to that of 239, and in THT 3597 b 8 there is another attestation of the Inf *latkatsi* (sic, cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 274) that is also found in 239 b 3. Since all attestations come from documents with MQ character, the accent pattern of the subjunctive cannot be determined.

= *ᴬlātkᵃ-* 'abschneiden', 'cut off' (tr) (x/-/-)

       Prs VII (x) -,-, *lātäṅkāṣ;* — | —;-,-, *lātäṅkāntär* Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
           Inf *lātäṅkātsi*
       Sub — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt I in
       PPt *lālätku*
       Ipv —

Eᴛʏᴍ. See Melchert, 1978, 123.

lār- '?' (tr) (-/m/-)

       Prs — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —

          Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub IXb (m) *lārṣṣīmar*,-,-; — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

Unclear hapax in THT 2251 a 3: //// *[s](o)motkaṃñe mā ceṃ lārṣṣīmar* •
"likewise I will not ... them". In theory, a word separation *ceṃl=ārṣṣīmar* is
also conceivable, but a noun *ceṃlV* is unattested as well and word-internal *n*
is usually not written with a mere anusvāra, so a word separation into *ceṃ*
lārṣṣīmar is more likely.

lāl- 'sich anstrengen', 'exert oneself, make an effort' (itr) (a+/a/a)
        Prs IXa (a+) -,-, *lalaṣṣäṃ*;-, *lalaścer*, *laläskeṃ* (MQ) Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part *lalaskemane*
          Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub IV (a) *lalyyau*,-,-; — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf *lalyitsi*
        Pt VII (a) -, *lalyyasta*, *lalyīya*; —
        PPt *lalālu | lalāloṣ*
        Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *lalaṣṣäṃ* is attested in KVāc 28 a 2: "(der Buddha) müht sich ab"
(Schmidt, 1986, 60, 97; see also Hackstein, 1995, 221), the 2.pl. Prs *lalaścer* in
THT 1554 b 3 (also listed in TEB I, 210, § 379,2 without ref.): *mā ṣ lalaścer mā*
yeṣ cimpalyi neścer //// "you do not make an effort and you are not capable
of ..."; the 3.pl. Prs *laläskeṃ* is found in THT 1860 a 3, the 1.sg. Sub *lalyy[au]* in
PK AS 6A b 1 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The
Abstr *läl(ñ)e* in 281 b 6 (MQ) does rather not belong to this root (thus WTG,
281), but to *lä-n-t-* 'go out' (see Couvreur, 1954, 86). According to Pinault, 1988,
105f., one may restore a Ger II *(la)lälle* with hypercorrect *-ä-* for *-i-* in PK NS 53
a 5. The 3.sg. Pt *lalyīya* 'he worked hard' as listed by Winter, 1990, 376 = 2005,
398 without ref. is attested in THT 1214 b 2: //// *lalyīya kartse-ś śaiṣṣentse*
cew w[i] ////. Further, there is the Priv *alālätte** 'relentless, indefatigable'
attesting to a former Sub I stem; see Hilmarsson, 1991, 86ff.
KAUSATIVUM I '± sich verausgaben lassen, ermüden', '± make exert oneself,
        tire' (tr) (a/-/-)
        Prs IXb (a) -,-, *lāläṣṣäṃ*; — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                    Inf —
          Pt —
          PPt —
          Ipv —

The Prs IXb *lālạ̈ṣṣäṃ* listed in TEB II, 234 without ref. with the meaning 'ermüden, bezwingen' is attested in THT 1340 frg. c a 2: //// *ḵartse-yamiṃ lālaṣṣaṃ* • "(s)he tires the benefactor/makes the benefactor exert himself". ETYM. Since the basic meaning of the root was 'exert oneself', etymologies that presuppose an original meaning 'be fatigued' (such as put forth by Winter, 1990, 377 = 2005, 399; Hackstein, 1995, 221f.; Adams, DoT, 549) fail to convince. The only obvious fact about this root is that it followed the same inflectional and derivational patterns as *ākl-* 'learn', but this may be due to a secondary process of leveling. At any rate, the root allomorph PT *lālä- is strongly reminiscent of the Hittite word *lālu* 'penis'; maybe this verb had a history similar to that of ModHG *fickfacken*, which denotes 'move to and fro, be busy, play tricks' without any sexual connotation, although it is likely that it had referred (also) to sexual intercourse right at the start.

läk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sehen', 'see, look' (tr) (x/x/x)
          Prs IXa (x) *lkāskau, lkāst, lkāṣṣäṃ; lkāskem, lkāścer-ne, lkāskeṃ |*
                    -, lkāstar, lkāstär;— Imp *lkāṣṣim,-, lkāṣṣi;-,-, lkāṣyeṃ |*
                    -,-, lkāṣṣītär;—
                    nt-Part *lkāṣṣeñca*
                    m-Part *lkāskemane*
                    Ger I *lkāṣṣälle* Abstr I —
          Prs V (m) *-,-, lkātär;-,-, lkāntär-c* Imp *—;-,-, lkoyentär*
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I *lkālle* Abstr I —
          Sub V (x) *lakau, lkāt, lakaṃ/lkā-ne; lkām-c, lkācer, lakaṃ |*
                    -,-, lkātär;-,-, lkāntär
                    Opt *lkoym,-, lakoy;-, lkoycer, lkoyeṃ | —;-,-, lkoyentär*
                    Ger II *lkālye* Abstr II *lkālyñe* Priv —
                    Inf *lkātsi*
          Pt I (x) *lyakāwa, lyakāsta, lyakā-ne; lyakām, lyakāso, lyakāre/*
                    lyakār-ne | -, lyakātai, lyakāte;-,-, lyakānte-me/lyākāṃte
          PPt *lyelyku | lyelykoṣ/lyelyäkoṣ* (MQ)/ *lyelyakor/lyelykor/lelkor*
          Ipv I (a) *pälyaka-me;-*

The 1.pl. Prs *lkāskem* is attested in PK NS 36A b 1 (Couvreur, 1964, 247), the 2.pl. Prs *lkāścer-ne* in THT 1680 a 2: *neseṃ\ • walo [we]ṣṣaṃ ḵ̯ce lkāścer-ne* "we are ... The king says: what you see ...". A 3.sg.mid. Imp *lka(ṣṣ)[ī](tär)* is to be restored in PK NS 350 a 6 (Couvreur, 1964, 241, fn. 17). The 2.sg. Pt *lyakāsta* is also found in THT 3597 (= Mainz 655, 1) b 4 (cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 274), and the MQ form *lyākāsta* in THT 1323 frg. 2 a 5. Beside the 3.pl. Pt *lyakār-ne* in 108 b 5 (S), the same 3.pl. ending variant *lyakār-me* is attested

in PK AS 18B b 4 (Pinault, 1984, 377; 2008, 78). The regular 2.sg.mid. Pt *lyakātai* (beside the MQ form in 207 a 2) is found in 358 frg., and the 3.sg.mid. Pt *lyakāte* (beside *lyākāte*) in 563 a 8 and 564 b 9. The 3.pl.mid. Pt variant *lyākāṃte* is attested in G-Su 3 (Pinault, 1987, 138). The PPt variant *lyelyäko(ṣ)* with non-syncopated root vowel *ä* is found in the metrical MQ text THT 1179 frg. a b 5. The imperative is usually suppleted by *pälk^a*- 'see', but in PK NS 31 b 4 we apparently have an imperative built from this root: *[wa]lo weṣṣaṃ snai nerke palyaka-me* "the king says: let us see without delay!" (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The same text also shows another remarkable imperative form, viz. *pkāka* (see s.v. *kāk^a*- 'call').

KAUSATIVUM IV 'sehen lassen, zeigen', 'make see, show' (tr) (m/-/a)

        Prs IXb (m) *lakäskemar,-,-;* — Imp —
                nt-Part *lakäṣṣeñca*
                m-Part *lakäskemane*
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub IXb — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *lakäṣñe* (S) Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt IV (a) -,-, *lakäṣṣa-me;* —
        PPt in *lelakäṣṣor*
        Ipv IV (a) -; *plakäskes*

A 1.sg. Prs *lakäskemar* is only listed in TochSprR(B), glossary, 164 without ref. The *nt*-Part *lakäṣṣeñcaṃ* is attested in PK NS 56 (= FK 1205) b 4 (see the photograph apud Van Windekens, 1940, pl. II). The Abstr *lakäṣñe* shows simplification of consonant clusters typical of the eastern TB variety (see Schmidt, 1986a, 648). Whether one can restore *(lelakä)ṣṣusa* in 85 a 1 remains uncertain; see ²TochSprR(B), 239 and Schmidt, 2001, 313, fn. 66. The 2.pl. Ipv *plakäskes* "show yourselves!" is attested in PK AS 17D a 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

= ^A*läk^(a)*- 'sehen', 'see' (tr) (x/-/-)

        Prs V (x) *lkām, lkāt, lkāṣ; lkāmäs, lkāc, lkeñc | -,-, lkātär;-,-, lkāntär*
                Imp -, *lyākaṣt, lyāk;-,-, lyākar*
                nt-Part *lkānt*
                m-Part *lkāmāṃ*
                Ger I *lkāl* Abstr I *lkālune*
                Inf *lkātsi*
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II *lkāl* Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 2.sg. Imp TA *lyākaṣt* is attested in PK NS 1 b 2 and 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; already listed by Couvreur, 1956, 98 without signature). The forms of the subjunctive stem, the preterit stem, and the PPt are mostly suppleted by ^A*pälk^a*- 'see', but nevertheless the Ger TA *lkāl*

is often used like a Ger II in the sense 'worth seeing'; see Thomas, 1952, 34f.; according to Thomas, 1952, 63 with fn. 1, the noun TA *lkāl* 'sight' is a substantivized Ger II. Synchronically, the imperatives TA *pälkār* and TA *pälkāc* probably also belong here, but diachronically they may rather come from *ᴬpälkᵃ-* 'see'.

KAUSATIVUM IV 'sehen lassen, zeigen', 'make see, show' (tr) (-/-/a)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
                nt-Part *läkṣantāñ*
                m-Part *lkäsmāṃ*
                Ger I *lkäṣlaṃ* Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt IV (a) *laläkṣāwā*,-,-; —
        PPt *laläkṣu*
        Ipv —

The Ger I TA *lkäṣlaṃ* (pl. fem.) is said to be attested in a document from TochSprR(A) by Couvreur, 1956, 97, who does not give a reference, but nevertheless seems to refer to A 227/8 b 5. The 3.sg. TA *lkäṣ* listed in TEB I, 174, § 298,1 is most likely only reconstructed.

SEM. Whereas in TB the verb is only construed with the obliquus, in TA the obliquus denoting the seen object can be substituted by an allative; see Kölver, 1965, 89 and Carling, 2000, 6. The same is true for the suppletive root *ᴬpälkᵃ-*. All in all, both TA roots are basically transitive. The TA middle forms have mostly passive function (see Schmidt, 1974, 231ff.). The exclusively attested middle forms of the TB Prs V all seem to be passives, whereas passive function is not attested for the middle forms of Prs IX (cf. Hackstein, 1995, 250). When the root as *lakle*/ TA *klop* 'sufferings' as its object, the phrase has the meaning 'suffer'; see Schmidt, 1974, 193f. with fn. 1. The gerundive *lkāṣṣälle* attested often in 291 has the same meaning as the kausativum, i.e., 'show', according to Thomas, 1952, 46 with fn. 2. ETYM. There compete two different attractive etymologies, and each of the two also has its flaws. As was first proposed by Meillet, 1911, 462 (more recently followed by Pinault, 1994, 122f. and Hackstein, 1995, 251), *läk-* may go back to the zero-grade allomorph pre-PT *luk-* of the PIE root *√leu̯k* 'shine' (otherwise continued by *luk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'light up'); this solution is phonologically impeccable for (*)*läk-* itself, but not so for the respective TB Pt I/ TA Imp stem PT *l'ækā-*, which (if assumed to be cognate) would have to owe its root vowel to an inner-Tocharian analogical innovation (aptly called "a neological vṛddhi to the zero-grade *läk-*" by Adams, DoT, 550); and even granted that there evidently already in PT existed a preterit stem *w'ætkā/ā̊-* from *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'decide, differ' that is to be explained precisely in terms of such a " neological vṛddhi" (see s.v.), such a strategy could hardly work also for isolated TB/TA *lyāk* 'visible', on which see Malzahn, 2007, 241, fn. 16. On the other hand, U.S. scholars since Lane, 1948, 307f. equate preterital PT *l'æk-* with the *lēg-* met in the Latin perfect *lēgī* from

PIE *√leĝ 'sammeln, auflesen' (²LIV, 397 without Toch.); see above all Weiss, 1993, 24f., 178f.; Jasanoff, 1998, 306; 2003, 193, § 112; Adams, DoT, 550. The problem with this etymology is that one (almost exclusively) finds TB/TA *l(ä)k-* outside the Pt/Imp of the grundverb paradigm; from a root with Narten behavior, beside pre-PT *lēg-ā- one should have expected an allomorph pre-PT *leg-ā- rather than a pre-PT *l$_e$g-ā- with a schwa secundum eventually turning into non-palatalizing PT *ä. Actually there is one single form that seems to attest to a pre-TB *lyäk-, viz. the Ipv *pälyaka-me*; it is true that as a nonce form one should rather have expected †*pälyāka*, but possibly the form attested is precisely a misspelling of such a form with root vowel -ā-. An ideal solution would be to derive preterital PT *l'æk- from PIE *lēĝ-, and what seems to be PT *läk- from PIE *luk-, but such a strategy would hardly please William of Ockham.

läṅk- '(herab)hängen', 'hang, dangle' (itr) (-/-/a)
		Prs I — Imp —
				nt-Part —
				m-Part *läṅkamane*
				Ger I — Abstr I —
		Sub — Opt —
				Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
				Inf —
		Pt I (a) —; -,-, *laṅkār-ne* (MQ)
		PPt —
		Ipv —
laṅkār-ne in the small fragment THT 1428 a 3 (MQ) looks like a Pt of this root, and since we are dealing with a text in archaic ductus, it can only render a Pt I form *lāṅkár-ne* and not a (zero-grade) 3.pl. Pt III form †*läṅkár-ne*

ANTIGRUNDVERB act. 'aufhängen', 'hang up', mid. 'haften an', 'be attached to'
		(tr/itr) (m/a/-)
		Prs VIII (m) —;-,-, *läṅksentär* Imp —
				nt-Part —
				m-Part —
				Ger I — Abstr I —
		Sub I (a) (tr) —; *laṅkäm-c,-,-* Opt —
				Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
				Inf —
		Pt —
		PPt —
		Ipv III (a) -; *plaṅso-ne*
It is likely that the Prs VIII form belongs to the antigrundverb and that its intransitive valency is due to the middle voice. The 1.pl. Sub *laṅkäm-c* is attested in PK AS 18A b 3; see below. The 2.pl. "Ipv I" *plaṅso-ne* "mit kaus. Bedeutung" listed in TEB I, 235, § 423 without ref. is an *s*-imperative of Class III, and the form is attested in THT 1507 a 3: *ṣarkameṃ plaṅso-ne*: "let him dangle from the back (?)".

Kʌusʌtɪvᴜᴍ II '(herab)hängen lassen', 'let dangle' (tr) (—)

        Prs IXb — Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part *läṅkäskemane* (MQ)/*laṅkaskemane* (MQ)

            Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

            Inf —

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

= ᴬ*läṅk-* 'hängen', 'dangle' (itr) (a+/-/-)

        Prs I (a+) -,-, *läṅkäṣ,-,-, läṅkiñc* Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part *läṅkmāṃ*

            Ger I — Abstr I —

            Inf —

        Sub — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

Aɴᴛɪɢʀᴜɴᴅᴠᴇʀʙ + Kʌusʌtɪvᴜᴍ II 'hängen lassen', 'let dangle' (tr) (a/a/-)

        Prs VIII (a) —;-,-, *läṅkseñc* Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

            Inf —

        Sub VII (a) — Opt *läññim,-,-;* —

            Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt II in

        PPt *lyalyäṅku*

        Pt III in

        PPt *laläṅkunt*

        Ipv —

Judging by the context, it is likely that TA *lalku* in A 12 b 5 also belongs to this root, because the form refers to the ears of a lion, cf. the translation by Sieg, Übers. I, 16 "die Ohren (...) ließ er ein wenig herabhängen". TG, 464, s.v. *läṅk-* proposes that TA *lalku* stands for *lalṅku and is a metrically shortened form of the PPt TA *laläṅku* from Pt III (otherwise also attested in A 378, 2). To be sure, the grapheme ⟨ṅ⟩ is, as far as I see, never attested as second member of an akṣara, so that the unusual sequence *lṅk* may simply have been unwritable (although I can see no reason why such an akṣara should not have been created). For other instances of (*)R/WäNC- > -R/WNC- in (mostly metrical texts of) Tocharian A, see TG, 97f. On the other hand, it cannot be excluded that we are dealing with a PPt of a Pt III from a root TA **läk-* 'lie', which quite

possibly may have denoted 'make (the ears) lie (flat)' (cf. ModHG *Ohren anlegen*); see s.v. *lyäk-* 'lie'.

SEM. The *m*-Part *länkamane* has intransitive meaning in H 149.add 13 b 2: *länkamane ma lkātsi nta* //// "hanging down [were the breasts of the women] which no man should [be allowed to] see" (Broomhead I, 126ff.), cf. also the *mo*-derivative *länkamñane päścane* "hanging breasts" in PK NS 102 b 3, as cited by Broomhead I, 128 and Hilmarsson, 1989, 98. As for the finite forms of the antigrundverb, while the middle is clearly intransitive (cf. Schmidt, 1974, 297), *lankäm-c* in PK AS 18A b 3 has transitive valency: *kampāl mā päst kalatar matsisa kauc lankäm-c* "bringst du das Gewand [den Mantel] nicht zurück [wieder], werden wir dich am [beim] Haupthaar aufhängen" (see Thomas, 1979a, 239, 244f., and 248), and the same holds for the Ipv III. It is therefore likely that we are dealing with a triple root consisting of grundverb-antigrundverb-kausativum as suggested by TEB II, 135, and that *länksenträ* in H 149.add 118 a 1 construed with the allative (*okoś wnolmi länks[e]nträ* "the beings hang on to success"; Broomhead I, 233f.) shows anticausative semantics simply because of the middle voice. For the allative construction met there, see also Carling, 2000, 74ff. In TA, the two attested finite active forms of the grundverb are construed with the allative and thereby intransitive (see Carling, 2000, 74f.; the second attestation of an active form in A 187 a 5 is without much context). In contrast, the Prs VIII TA *länkseñc* in A 58 b 1 is transitive: *länkseñc hāräs wrok* "Perlenketten lassen sie herabhängen" (Sieg, Übers. II, 10). ETYM. Maybe to be derived from PIE *√leng 'move'; see Adams, DoT, 551.

lä-n-t- 'hinausgehen', 'go out, emerge' (itr) (a+/a/a)

        Prs Xa (a+) *lnaskau,-, lnaṣṣäṃ; lnaskem,-, lnaskeṃ*

            Imp -,-, *lnaṣṣi-ne;-,-, lännaṣyeṃ*

            nt-Part —

            m-Part *lnaskemane*

            Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub ? (a) *lannu, lant, laṃ;-,-, laṃ* Opt *länñam* (sic), *lyñit* (MQ), *laññi;*

            -,-, laññeṃ

            Ger II *lalyai* Abstr II *lalñe* Priv —

            Inf *lantsi*

        Pt VI (a) *latau, lac, lac/laiś* (S)/*laś/läco* (MQ)/*läca-ne;-, latso, lateṃ;*

            -,-, ltais

        PPt *ltu| ltuweṣ*

        Ipv VI/VII (a) -; *platstso*

The 3.pl. Imp *lännaṣyeṃ* is attested in PK AS 17J a 5 (Pinault, 1994, 115), the 1.sg. Sub *lannu* and the Ger II *lalyai* in PK AS 17D a 2 and a 4 (Pinault, 1994, 127ff.), and the 3.sg. Opt *laññi* in THT 1926 a 3. *länñam* in the small fragment H 149.153 a 2 is most likely a 1.sg. Opt just like following *yamīm* (cf. Broomhead I, 277): //// *ente länñam ostameṃ mā śāl yamīm* //// "if I become a monk/nun (lit. leave the house) I would not make a *śāl*". Broomhead II, 233 interprets *śāl* as the tree name attested in 275 a 2 (< Skt. *śāla-* 'Shorea robusta'),

but I do not see much sense in this interpretation (one may toy with the idea
that we have to do with homonymic Skt. *śāla-* 'fence, enclosure' — actually,
these two words may have the same origin, cf. EWAia, 631; the Śāla tree was
an important building material in Ancient India; see Syed, 1992, 559; for the
iconography cf. Palidoni, 2007, 129ff.; D. Q. Adams points out to me (p.c.) that
we may be dealing with Skt. *śālā-* 'house' and with a word play: "I will leave
[my] house but not make a house"). It cannot be decided whether the 3.pl.
laññeṃ in the MQ text 391 b 6 *(ono)lmi ostameṃ laññeṃ* is subjunctive or
optative, but for morphological reasons an optative is more likely (see below).
The 2.sg. of the preterit is *lac* < *h₁ludʰ-e-s, which is homonymous with the
3.sg. *lac* < *h₁ludʰ-e-t; the 2.sg. *lac* is attested with certainty in Qu 34.1 g 7 and
d 3; see Pinault, 1994a, 213ff.; 2000a, 158. The alleged 2.sg. *lät* as listed in WTG,
283 is due to an emendation of *lä[c]* in 224 a 2 (MQ) (certainly to be read *läc*;
see Pinault, 1994, 194; Schmidt, 2000, 226; Pinault, 2001b, 165f.). Consequently,
lat in 384 a 4 (S) is not a preterit, but a subjunctive. Lane, 1953, 491 correctly
objected that one would expect a 2.sg. Sub of this root to come out as *lant*;
however, that is, in my opinion, exactly the form we indeed have in this
passage: instead of *lat twe ostameṃ* "you will become a monk" it has to be
read *lan<t> twe* with the usual simplification of *-tt-* in sandhi (ligatures of ⟨nt⟩
and ⟨tt⟩ are indistinguishable in this manuscript). The 3.sg. Pt variants *laś* and
laiś are often attested in documents of profane nature (see Couvreur, 1954, 90),
and *laiś* is also found in the eastern text 107 b 4; for the informal-style features
involved, see Schmidt, 1986a, 638 and 642. The 3.sg. Pt *läco* is found in the MQ
text THT 1248 b 2 (metrical): //// *wärttoṣca läco* | |//// "went to the forest";
the variant *läca-ne* is attested in PK NS 506 b 2 (unpublished, reading
according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

KAUSATIVUM I 'hinausgehen machen', 'let go out' (tr) (a/-/-)

        Prs IXb (a) —;-,-, *läntäskeṃ-ne* (Š, sic) Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv III (m) *plyatstsar-me* (S, sic);-

= ^A*lä-n-t-* 'hinausgehen', 'go out, emerge' (itr) (a+/a/a)

        Prs VIII (a+) *läntsam,-, läntäṣ; läntsamäs,-, läntseñc/läṃtse*
                Imp -,-, *läntṣā-m;* —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *läntäsmāṃ/läntsamāntāp*
                Ger I *läntṣäl* Abstr I —
                Inf *läntässi/läntassi*
        Sub II (a) *läñcam,-, läñcäṣ;-,-, läñceñc/läñce* Opt *läñcim,-, läñciṣ-äṃ;* —
                Ger II *läñcäl* Abstr II *läñclune*

      Pt VI (a) *lcā,-, läc/lcā-ṃ;-,-, lcär*
      PPt *laltu/lalntu/lantu*
      Ipv VI (a) *pläc; pälcäs*

The restoration to a 1.sg. Opt TA *lä(ñcim)* in A 266 a 2 by TG, 465 is assured by an Old Turkish parallel version (see already Müller/Sieg, 1916, 402; in addition, there is now also the parallel version MaitrHami (XVI) 13 b 24 available); the restoration to TA *(lä)ñciṣ-äṃ* in A 166 b 5 remains uncertain.
SEM. The verb used together with *ostmeṃ*/TA *waṣtäṣ* 'from the house' denotes 'become a monk/nun'. As a verb of motion, it can be construed with an obliquus of direction (see Thomas, 1983, 18), but it is basically intransitive.
ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√h₁leu̯dʰ 'steigen, wachsen' (²LIV, 248f.); *lät-* is the outcome of the zero grade by sound law (on *lut-* 'remove', see Adams, 1978a, 447). For the subjunctive stems, see chap. Sub VII 22.2.3., fn. 3 and 22.2.3.2. The present stems were clearly based on (previous stages of) the respective subjunctive stems. The forms outside the present and subjunctive stem are usually nasalless with the exception of the PPt variants TA *lalntu/lantu*. As for the preterit, see Pinault, 1994, 193f.; Widmer, 2001, 181ff., and chap. Pt VI.

ᴬlätk- → *ᴬlitk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'remove'

läm⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sitzen', 'sit' (itr) (a/a/x)
      Prs V (a) — Imp -,-, *lamoy*;—
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub V (a) -, *lāmat, lāmaṃ; lamam,-, lamaṃ* Opt -,-, *lamoy*;—
          Ger II *lamalle* Abstr II *lamälñe* (MQ)/*lamalñe* Priv —
          Inf *lamatsi*
      Pt I (x) -, *lyamāstā* (MQ), *lyama;-,-, lymāre* [| -,-, *lmāte*;—]
      PPt *lmau | lmoṣ*
      Ipv I (a) *plāma; plamās-ñ* (Š)/*lämās* (S)

The present stem is usually suppleted by *ṣäm-* 'sit', but, nevertheless, *lamoy* in PK AS 16.3 b 6 can only be imperfect, and not optative (see Pinault, 1989a, 189). TochSprR(B) further restores a 1.sg. Opt *la(moym)* in 580 a 3. The Abstr *lamalñ[e]* is attested in the small fragment THT 1539 frg. g a 1 (Schmidt, 2006, 461). The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. The 2.sg. Pt *lyamāstā* is found in 344 frg. 6. The only middle form, 3.sg.mid. Pt *lmāte* is attested in the monastery record PK Cp 32, 4 (Pinault, 1984a): *saṅkrām wtetse lmāte* "le monastère s'est assis de nouveau" (Pinault, 1984a, 26); "le monastère ... s'est de nouveau installé" (Pinault, 1984a, 31); "became set up" (Adams, ²DoT, s.v. *ṣäm-*). Hence, *lmāte* does not have stative meaning, and therefore semantically rather belongs with the kausativum paradigm, which is reminiscent of the behavior of the two middle Ipv I forms *karsar* and *prutkar*, and of that of the middle forms from *ᴬᴮpyutk-* as well; see chap. Voice 5.2.2.1. *[lämā]s* in the difficult passage 331 a 5 can be either preterit or imperative (the

akṣaras may be damaged, but another reading is, nevertheless, excluded, and a form of this root is also supported by the Old Turkish gloss *olgortmıš ärsär* 'wenn gesetzt worden ist', i.e., "wenn man (einen Mönch) sich aufzuhalten veranlaßt hat"; see Maue, 2009, 24), though Ipv is morphologically more likely, because the Pt is of Subclass 1 (omission of the imperative particle *p-* is attested once more in the same text, cf. Pinault, 2005, 496).

KAUSATIVUM I 'setzen', 'zum Erliegen bringen', 'set', 'let subside' (tr) (x/-/x)

        Prs IXb (x) -,-, *lamäṣṣäṃ*;— | -,-, *lamästär-ne*;— Imp —
                nt-Part *lämäṣṣeñcai* (MQ)
                m-Part —
                Ger I *lamäṣṣalle* (sic) Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I (m) -,-, *lmāte*;—
        Pt II (x) -,-, *lyāma*;— | -,-, *lyāmate*;—
        PPt *lyelyamoṣ*
        Ipv —

A 3.sg. Prs (or Sub) *lamäṣṣäṃ* is attested in H add.149 112 b 4 (Broomhead I, 51) and in IOL Toch 585 b 3 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.; both forms are without context), the Ger I *lamäṣṣalle* in KVāc 20 b 1f. (Schmidt, 1986, 53), and the PPt *ly(e)lyamoṣ* in IOL Toch 753 b 3 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.).

= ᴬ*läm⁽ⁱ⁾-* 'sitzen', 'sit' (itr) (-/a/a)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub V (a) *lamam*,-, *lamaṣ*;— Opt *lmim*,-,-;—
                Ger II *lmālyāṃ* Abstr II *lmālune*
        Pt I (a) *lymā*, *lymāṣt*, *lyäm/lymā-ṃ*;-,-, *lamar*
        PPt *lmo*
        Ipv I (a) -; *pälmäs/plamäs* (sic)

ᴬ*ṣäm-* 'sit' provides the suppletive present stem.

KAUSATIVUM I 'setzen', 'niedersitzen machen', 'set', 'make sit down' (tr) (m/x/x)

        Prs VIII (m) -,-, *lmäṣtär*;— Imp —;-, *lämṣāc*,-
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub IX (x) -,-, *lmäṣtär*;-,-, *lmäsaṃntär* Opt -,-, *lmäṣiṣ*;—
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II (x) -,-, *lyalymā-ṃ*;— | -,-, *lyalymāt*;—
        PPt *lyalymu*
        Ipv IV (m) -; *pälmāṣār*

TG, 475 proposed to read a 3.sg. Prs TA *lmäṣ* in A 295 a 3: *triśul <l>mäṣ*; but since the newly discovered parallel text YQ 36 beyond doubt has TA *mäṣ*, this word separation is now excluded (cf. Carling, 2000, 220, fn. 443). Similarly, the proposed restoration of a 3.sg.mid. Opt TA *lmā(ṣi)trä* in A 261 b 4 by TG, 476 is now also proven incorrect by the parallel text YQ 12 a 7 (cf. Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 124ff. and Pinault, 1999, 195); it has to be restored to 3.pl. Sub TA *lmā(san)trä* instead. TA *lamäṣ* in A 5 b 1 further listed as probable form of this root by TG, 476 has to be emended to TA *lapäṣ*, according to Siegling apud Sieg, Übers. I, 8, fn. 8.

SEM. The grundverb when used together with the obliquus (of locatival meaning) of *ost*/TA *waṣt* 'house' has the special meaning 'stay at home' = 'being a householder, not being a monk/nun', and together with *ompalskoññe* 'meditation' 'sit in meditation' (see Kölver, 1965, 112 and ²TochSprR(B), 221). The kausativum forms can usually be translated by unmarked 'set', but at least *lämäṣṣeñcai* in 212 b 5 (MQ) should be rendered by 'let subside': 212 b 4f. *kleśanmaṣṣem tekänma po lämäṣṣeñcai* "[o du, der du] die Kleśa-Krankheiten völlig zum Erliegen bringst"; see Dietz, 1981, 111; similarly, YQ 19 b 5 *(śaśä)lpuräṣ śpālmem āsānā lmäṣtär-m* is best rendered as "having made them (enter) he makes them sit down on the seat of honor" (Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 193). ETYM. Usually connected with PIE *√lembH 'schlaff herabhängen' (²LIV, 411 with ref.), but this is hardly likely. Maybe rather a cognate of Gk. νωλεμής 'restless' and derived from a PIE root *√h₃lemH '± rest'.

lik⁽ᵃ⁾- '(ab)waschen', 'wash' (tr) (m/m/m)

       Prs VI (m) -,-, *laikanatär*; — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub V (m) — Opt —;-,-, *laikontär-ñ*
           Ger II — Abstr II *laikalñe* Priv —
           Inf *laikatsi/laikasi* (M)
       Pt I (m) -,-, *laikāte*;-,-, *laikānte*
       PPt *lalaikau* | in *lalaikarmem*
       Ipv —

The reading *l[ai]kanatä* in H 150.110 b 4 is certain, cf. Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 262. Sieg, 1955, 82 proposed to read and restore a Ger I *[l](ai)[kana]ll(e)* in Fill. M 3 b 1 (instead of *[sono]päll(e)* which is what Filliozat read), but according to Schmidt, 1974, 77, fn. 1, this reading cannot be supported by the visible traces of the akṣaras in question. Beside *laikasi* in 324 b 5 (M), the regular Inf *laikatsi* is attested in IOL Toch 723 b 2 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.).

KAUSATIVUM III act. 'jd. waschen', 'wash sb.', mid. 'waschen', 'wash' (tr) (x/-/-)

       Prs VIII (x) -,-, *likṣan-me*; — | -,-, *lyikṣtär/likṣtär*; —
           Imp —;-,-, *likṣyen-ne* | -,-, *līkṣītär*; —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I *lyikṣalle* Abstr I —

     Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf —
     Pt —
     PPt —
     Ipv —

In PK NS 111 we have the variants 3.sg.mid. Prs *lyikṣtär* (b 1) and *likṣtär* (a 3) (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

= ᴬ*likᵃ̆-* '(ab)waschen', 'wash' (tr) (-/a/-)
     Prs I — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf *līktsi/lyīktsi*
     Sub V (a) -,-, *lekaṣ*;— Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II —
     Pt I in
     PPt *lāleku*
     Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. The TB grundverb can be construed with obliquus (objects are, e.g., 'face', 'hands') and it is therefore basically transitive, although it can also be used absolutely without object. Adams, DoT, 553 took the kausativum to have the meaning "(active and passive) 'wash' [object: another person]", but this only holds for the active forms. Of the two middle attestations of the kausativum, one is direct-reflexive (A(Ud.) 1 a 6), the other is a gloss on Skt. *nirdhūyate* and is interpreted as a passive by Schmidt, 1974, 235 (M 158.1 a 4, edited in SHT 7, 1738). According to Winter, 2003a, 119 = 2005, 540, the exact meaning of the verbal root is "rubbing or another cleansing activity". Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from PIE *√u̯lei̯kᵘ̯ 'befeuchten' (²LIV, 696f.); see Hackstein, 1995, 122f. (and apud Bock, 2008, 285) with counterarguments against the alternative etymology by Schmidt, 1987a, 296f; Adams, DoT, 554.

litᵃ̆- 'herunterfallen, herausfallen, sich abwenden, verlassen', 'fall (down, off), abandon, move away' (itr) (m/a/a)
     Prs IV (m) -,-, *laitotär*;-,-, *laitontär* Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part *laitomane*
          Ger I — Abstr I —
     Sub V (a) —;-,-, *laitaṃ* Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II *laitalñe* Priv *alaitacci*
          Inf —
     Pt I (a) -,-, *lita*;—
     PPt *litau*
     PPt *lalaitau* | *lalaitaṣ*
     Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *laitotär* is attested in an unpublished Berlin text, according to Schmidt, 1974, 39 with fn. 2 (without ref.), which can now be identified as THT 1470 b 1 (without context); the same form *laitoträ* is also found in IOL Toch 524 a 3 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.). The Priv *alaitacci* 'not falling down' is, according to Couvreur, 1954, 82, attested in FK 1205 (= PK NS 56) b 1 (ed. by Van Windekens, 1940 with an incorrect word separation). The existence of a full-vowel preterit *laita* as listed in the manuals for H 149.add 28 b 5 is uncertain; see WTG, 285, where Krause speculates about reading a subjunctive form *laitaṃ* instead. Such a full-vowel subjunctive (3.sg. or 3.pl.) is now attested in the small fragment THT 1275 b 1: //// *(śa)śāyormeṃ laitaṃ su* //// "having lived (s)he/they fall(s). The ...". As for H 149.add 28 b 5, Broomhead I, 177f. indeed emends a 3.pl. Sub *laitaṃ*, which makes the best sense in this passage: *(ono)[l(m)eṃtsa] laita<ṃ> ñäkcye śaiṣṣemeṃ* "they will fall from the divine world into [the world] of the beings (?)" (cf. Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 136; there is no trace of an anusvāra on the manuscript). TochSprR(B), glossary, 165 and WTG, 283 claim a Ger *lyitälle* belongs to a causative (with non-kausativum morphology!) ('herabfallen lassen') of this root, but we may have to do with a different root here, for which see s.v. *lyi(n)ᵃ-* '± place'. On the other hand, the two other forms said to belong to such a causative by TochSprR(B) and WTG, i.e., the 3.sg. Pt *lita* and the PPt *litau*, are intransitive: 282 b 7 *te ṣarmtsa lita su hetubālike bhavāggrä postäññe yai* "for this reason, Hetubalike fell and achieved the highest sphere of existence (= *bhavāgra*)"; the PPt *litau* in H 149 add.13 b 3 has the meaning 'slipped off (of a garment)' (Broomhead I, 126f.); *litale* in Fill. W 42 a 6 is also unclear. The reduplicated PPt is attested more often than the unreduplicated one (also in SHT 7, 1704, for which see Schmidt, 1990, 476f.; 1994b, 270f.; 2000, 233f.) and it seems to have a similar meaning, cf. 333 a 5f. (Pārājika): *mā lalālu mā ṣpä śakets so ʾ lalaitau ṣamāñemeṃ mäsketär* "One who has shown no effort, and one who is not a son of the Śākyas, he has fallen from monkhood". We are dealing with a PPt variant from an *ā*-preterit stem with full vowel in the root, i.e., Subclass 5, which is actually to be expected beside a full-vowel subjunctive stem. It has to be pointed out that TA has basically the same ablaut variation, i.e., full vowel in the present/subjunctive vs. vowel *ä in the preterit, and full vowel in the PPt presupposing a preterit stem *letā-.

= ᴬ*lit⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'herunterfallen, herausfallen, sich abwenden, verlassen', 'fall (down, off), abandon, move away' (itr) (m/x/a)

    Prs III (m) —;-,-, *litantär* Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf *litatsi*
    Sub V (x) -,-, *letaṣ;*— | -,-, *letatär;*— Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *litālune/letlune*
    Pt I (a) -,-, *līt;*—
    PPt *lāletu*
    Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. Sub TA *letatär* is attested in YQ 11 b 4. TA *lit* and TA *letaṣ* are considered as uncertain forms by TG, 465. Whereas the existence of TA *letaṣ* in the small fragment A 408 a 2 indeed remains uncertain (although the morphological analysis is impeccable), 3.sg. Pt TA *līt* in A 110 a 4 belongs here with some plausibility ("the shyness fell off").

ANTIGRUNDVERB/KAUSATIVUM I '± herunterfallen lassen', '± let fall down'

      (tr) (a/-/-)
      Prs VIII (a) —;-,-, *letseñc* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —

The form is restored in A 138 b 5 by TG, 467 (s.v. *let*): *yokās letse(-)*\ "they let fall down the hairs (?)" — on the other hand, judging by the TB plural *yākwa* 'hair', one should rather expect a different plural formation for the word for 'hair' in TA, but the alternative 'colors' does not make much sense here; the passage is without further context.

SEM. In both languages the verb has the meaning 'fall down, fall off' in a concrete sense (e.g., from a throne in 5 a 4; from heaven in A 58 a 6), and in a figurative sense ('abandon monkhood'); in this figurative sense the meaning may lack the connotation of a downward movement, e.g., when used to describe the movement into a *higher* sphere of existence (as in H 149 add.13 b 3), or moving away from one of the forms of existence (e.g., also from hell). Only in this sense the verb is equivalent to Skt. √cyu 'go away', cf. K 7 a 1f.: *(nr)[ai]ytam[eṃ] laitaṃ* ~ Skt. *narakāc cyuto* "von den Höllen (ge)fallen"; see Sieg, 1938, 29 with fn. 1. On the semantics, see also Melchert, 1978, 110, who in addition posits the meaning 'pass (away)'. ETYM. The manuals (WTG, 283, 285; TEB II, 235f.; Adams, DoT, 554, 561) usually separate *lit-* and *lait-*, which is no doubt a more correct solution with respect to diachrony, but since PT *läytā- supplies the finite preterit forms for PT *lyātā- in both languages, I thought it appropriate to subsume the two stems under one single entry. Similarly, Schmidt, 1974, 39, fn. 1; Melchert, 1978, 110; and Pinault, 1994, 126f. The root is usually derived from PIE *√leị̯t '(weg)gehen' (²LIV, 410), cf. Melchert, 1978, 110 ("*leit(h)-") and Hackstein, 2002, 9 with ref. and fn. 23 (Hackstein explicitly argues for a PIE seṭ root *√leith₂). In the terms of Tocharian, however, the concrete meaning 'fall down from something' is better to be taken as the original one, whereas the meaning 'go way, part with, abandon' can easily be interpreted as a secondary one. As per Adams, DoT, 561, the stem PT *lāytā- will have started out as a denominative formation.

litk⁽ᵃ⁾?- 'entfernen', 'remove' (tr) (a/a/a)

      Prs IXb (a) — Imp -,-, *lyitkäṣṣi;* —

           nt-Part —

           m-Part —

           Ger I — Abstr I —

      Sub II (a) -,-, *lyecciṃ* (sic);-,-, *lyaitkeṃ* Opt —

           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

           Inf —

      Pt III (a) —;-,-, *laitkär* (MQ)

      PPt —

      Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *lyitkäṣṣaṃ* listed in TEB I, 214, § 383,3 is probably only reconstructed. The 3.sg. Sub *lyecciṃ* is found in KVāc 20 b 4 (for †*lyaiccäṃ*, see Schmidt, 1986, 138), so the Sub stem is clearly thematic. The 3.pl. Pt *laitkär* is found in H 149.add 122 a 2, a text with MQ character. The PPt *litku* is somewhat controversial. The form is a hapax in 587 a 5: *pilko litku* is generally translated as "averted gaze"; WTG, 283 translates rather freely "leidenschaftslos". On his part, Couvreur, 1954, 87 doubts that we have to do with a PPt of this root at all, arguing one would expect *litkau, i.e., a PPt to an intransitive grundverb. Saito, 2006, 183f. analyzes *litku* as Pt III PPt of the *plätku-* type (see chap. PPt 14.1.1.). Note that the TA grundverb also seems to have transitive valency.

= ᴬ*litk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'entfernen', 'remove' (tr) (-/-/a)

      Prs — Imp —

           nt-Part —

           m-Part —

           Ger I — Abstr I —

           Inf —

      Sub V — Opt —

           Ger II — Abstr II *litkālune*

      Pt I (a) *litkā-ṃ*,-,-; —

      PPt *litko/* in *lätkoräṣ*

      Ipv —

For morphological reasons, one should rather expect an intransitive stem, but the sole finite attestation is transitive: YQ 41 a 6 *(oktuk o)kät pi kleśāṣiṃ wars tmäkyok santānäṣ litkāṃ* "Ebenso habe ich den Schmutz der 88 *kleśas* aus (ihrem) (Bewußtseins)strom entfernt"; see Wilkens, 2008, 424 with ref. to the Old Turkish parallel.

KAUSATIVUM III 'entfernen', 'remove' (tr) (—)

      Prs — Imp —

           nt-Part —

           m-Part —

           Ger I — Abstr I —

           Inf —

      Sub — Opt —

           Ger II — Abstr II —

Pt II in
PPt *lyalyītku*
Ipv —

SEM. According to Couvreur, 1956, 69, TA *litk⁽ᵃ⁾-* has the meaning 'tilgen, herabsinken, niedergeschlagen sein'. According to Melchert, 1978, 111, the difference in meaning between this root and *litᵃ-* 'fall off' is "one of active participation of the subject". ETYM. According to Melchert, 1978, 111, we are dealing with a *-sk̂e/o- present *lit-sk̂e/o- from the same root as to be seen in *litᵃ-* 'fall off'; see most recently Hackstein, 2002, 8f. (who sets up a form with laryngeal *h₂ *lith₂-sk̂e/o-). For the TA variant *lätk-*, see Melchert, 1978, 120 and s.v. *rätkᵃ?-* '(a)rise'.

lipᵃ- 'übrigbleiben', 'remain, be left over' (itr) (m/m/a)

    Prs III (m) -,-, *lipetär/lyīpetär;*-,-, *lyipentär* Imp -,-, *līpitär-ne;* —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V (m) -,-, *lipātär;* — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf *lipātsi*
    Pt I (a) -,-, *lipa/lyīpa;*-,-, *lyipāre*
    PPt *lipoṣ*
    Ipv —

The palatalized initial of the 3.pl.mid. Prs is certain: in 590 a 8 (MQ) the upper part of the akṣara *ly(i)* is clearly readable (not in WTG), in line a 5 the lower part of the akṣara *[ly]i* is almost lost, but traces of the *y* still remain. A similarly palatalized 3.sg.mid. Prs variant *lyīpetär* is now found in the small fragment THT 1227 b 1: • *mā lyī⟨⟨pe⟩⟩tṛa yolai* //// (⟨pe⟩ is added under the line by another hand), and a palatalized 3.sg.act. Pt variant *l[y]īpa* in H add.149 88 b 9 (see Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 214 contra Broomhead I, 250); the 3.pl.act. Pt *lyipāre* is attested in PK LC XXXVI, 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). A PPt *lipo(ṣ)* can be restored in H 150.117 a 5.
= ᴬ*lip⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'übrigbleiben', 'remain, be left over' (itr) (-/-/a)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt I (a) -,-, *lipā-ci;*-,-, *lepar*
    PPt *lipo/lyipo*
    Ipv —

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'übriglassen; verlassen', 'leave (behind)' (tr) (-/a/a)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub VII (a) -, *lipñät*,-;— Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt III (a) -,-, *lyepäs*;—
    PPt *lyalypu* | †*lyalyipu* in *lyalyipuräṣ*
    Ipv —

Lexicalized PPt TA *lyalypu* 'karma' probably shows the lautgesetzlich result of pre-PT *-lip-, whereas the Abs TA *lyalyipuräṣ* 'having left behind' has *-lyip-* from pre-PT -lei̯p-; a bit differently Kim, 2006, 133 and 2007b, 90 with fn. 46. It is possible that the latter PPt synchronically rather belongs to an (unattested) Pt II stem from a Kaus. II paradigm; see chap. Pt III 9.1.6.2.
ETYM. From PIE *√lei̯p 'kleben bleiben' (²LIV, 408); Adams, DoT, 555; see also Pinault, 2001a, 254ff.

liy⁽ᵃ⁾?- '± abwischen, reinigen', '± wipe away, cleanse' (tr) (m/-/-)

    Prs IXa (m) -,-, *lyyastär-ne*;— Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt III in
    PPt *leleyu*
    Ipv —

The alleged Pt *lyyāsa* in 107 b 4 is not a verbal form of this root (thus, e.g., WTG, 285), but a nominal form denoting 'limbs' evidently from a completely different root, as first recognized by Winter, 2003a, 117f. = 2005, 538f. on the evidence of a second attestation in PK NS 53 a 4; this view can now also be supported by the Sanskrit parallel version of 107; see Schmidt, 2008a, 326f. and Pinault, 2008, 147f. As for the Prs *lyyastärne*, Adams, DoT, 553 suspected that this is a spelling for **lyyāstärne*, but the small fragment H 150.110 a 4 does not show any MQ features; therefore, this is rather a Prs IX form in which original stem-final PT *-ā- was replaced by *-ä-. As for the PPt *leleyu* found in 33 a 3, TochSprR(B), glossary, 166 and WTG, 285 assign this form to a root *ley-* 'abziehen, loslassen' for which there is no other evidence, so it is best taken as a PPt from this root, as per Adams, DoT, 553. The problem with this form is then that it clearly looks like a PPt to a Pt III, whereas the Prs IX form of Tocharian B seen together with the TA evidence would have rather suggested the existence of a Pt I †*lyiya*. For this reason, both Adams, l.c., and Peters, 2006, 346 wanted the *-ey-* of this form to have replaced a more original

*-ĭy- (the latter explicitly assuming a sound change "*leleyu < *lælīyº*"), but note that the absence of palatalization militates strongly against such an explanation: even granted that -ey- could indeed be some kind of substitute for *-ĭy-, one ought to have expected †*lyelyeyu*.

= ᴬ*lyᵃ-* 'abwischen (Tränen)', 'fegen', 'wipe away (tears)', 'sweep' (tr) (x/-/-)

Prs VIII (x) —;-,-, *lyāseñc*|-,-, *lyāṣtär*;— Imp —
      nt-Part —
      m-Part *lyāsmāṃ*
      Ger I — Abstr I —
      Inf —
Sub V — Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II *lyālune*
Pt I/III in
PPt in *lyālyoräṣ*
Ipv —

SEM. The TB present form is attested without much context in H 150.110 a 3: //// (e)ntwe lyyas[tä]rne • (Broomhead I, 267). The meaning 'wipe away' is set up on the evidence of TA, and a meaning 'cleanse' would also fit the TB PPt in 33 a 3, as per Adams, DoT, 553. The TA forms have mostly 'tears' as object (A 70 a 1; A 99 b 1; A 108 b 3; A 109 b 2; A 170 a 4; A 297 a 1), once 'blood' (A 10 b 6), twice 'the ground' (A 148 b 6; A 266 a 6), so that TG, 467 deduced a meaning 'fegen' ('sweep'). The middle is (transitive-)reflexive (A 108 b 3 "wipes away her tears"). ETYM. According to Adams, DoT, 553 (cf. Adams, 1988a, 67), "AB *li-ā-* reflect PTch *li-ā-* from PIE *leih$_x$(-eh$_a$)-*, otherwise seen only in Sanskrit *līyate* 'disappear, vanish'". As a matter of fact, the TA evidence (at least the Prs VIII by its preservation of final -ā- and also the PPt) seems to imply PT *l(')yā-*, and the TB evidence PT *l(')äyā-*, which is reminiscent of the situation found with the roots *twᵃ-/twās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'shine'/ ᴬ*twᵃ-/* ᴬ*twās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'burn' and *suwᵃ-/swās⁽ᵃ⁾-/* ᴬ*suw⁽ᵃ⁾-/*ᴬ*swās⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'rain'. With respect to the PPt *leleyu* it is probably the best strategy to assume that we are dealing here with one of the few roots that preserved distinct traces of both an aorist (PIE *liH-t > PT *l(')äyā) and an active perfect (PIE *le-loiH-e > PT *læy-ä-sā) still in historical times; at least one other such root seems to be *mit⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'set out, go, come' (see s.v.).

lu?- '(ab)reiben', 'rub (off)' (tr) (-/-/a)

Prs — Imp —
      nt-Part —
      m-Part —
      Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
      Inf —
Pt I (a) -,-, *lyawā-ne*;—
PPt in *lyelyuwormeṃ*
Ipv —

The manuals set up this root as *lyu-*. However, judging by TA, the root has rather to be set up as *lu-* (probably A-characterless in contrast to *lu^ă-* 'send'), the palatalization in the preterit and the PPt (which actually provide all of the attestations of this root in TB) being due to the special kind of preterit stem formation, i.e., that of Subclass 7. TochSprR(B), followed by WTG, 285, restores a 3.sg. Prs *ly(u)weträ* in 514 b 4, but according to Couvreur, 1954, 83, one has rather to restore *ly(e)weträ* 'sends'. The form is without context, and the original manuscript, which may give a clue to the correct restoration, is lost, so the question cannot be decided. TochSprR(B) further proposes to restore *(lya)[wä]re* in 340 a 6.

= ^A*lu^ʔ-* '(ab)reiben', 'rub (off)' (tr) (—)

      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv I (m) *pälwār,* —

According to Schmidt, 1974, 45f., fn. 7, the Ipv TA *pälwār* in A 433 a 8 belongs here judging by the Tibetan parallel version. Eтyм. Maybe from the PIE root set up as *√leu̯h₃ 'waschen' (²LIV, 418 without Toch.).

lu^ă- 'senden', 'send' (tr) (m/a/a)

      Prs III (m) *lyewemar,-, lyewetär;-,-, lyewentär*
            Imp -, *lyewītär* (sic), *lyewītär;* —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *lyewemane*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub V (a) -,-, *lāwäṃ* (MQ, sic); — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt I (a) *lywāwa, lywāsta/lyuwāsta* (MQ), *lyuwa;* —
      PPt *lypauwa* (sic) | *lwoṣ/lypaṣ* (sic)
      Ipv I (a) *plāwa; pluwas*

The 1.sg.mid. Prs *lyewemar* is attested in PK LC XXVI, 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.); the 3.sg.mid. Prs *lyewetär* also in LP 3 a 3 and in PK AS 17D a 3 (Pinault, 1994, 128), and, according to Couvreur, 1954, 83, *ly(e)wetär* is further to be restored in 514 b 4 (contra WTG and TochSprR(B); see above s.v. *lu^ʔ-* 'rub'). The 3.sg.mid. Imp *lyewītär* is found in PK AS 16.3 b 6 (Pinault, 1989a, 157). *lāwä<ṃ>* (sic! not *lāwaṃ* as listed in WTG, 284) in the small fragment 316 a 2 is a 3.sg. Sub from this root (as is proven by the Skt. parallel NiḥsPāt 10), for the weakening of -*aṃ* to -*äṃ* and the omission of *ṃ*, see chap. Sub I/V 18.2.1. On the PPts *lypauwa* (in 591 a 3

from Sängim) and *lypaṣ* (in the letter 492 a 3), see Peyrot, 2008, 88 and 150f.
The 2.pl.act. Ipv *pluwas* can be found in PK LC X, 6 (see Pinault, 2008, 381).
= ᴬ*luⁱ̯-* 'senden', 'send' (tr) (-/a/a)

      Prs — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf —
      Sub V (a) *lawam, lawat,-;—* Opt —
          Ger II *lwāl* Abstr II —
      Pt I (a) *lywā, lywāṣt, lyu/lywā-ṃ;-,-, lawar*
      PPt *lwo*
      Ipv I (a) -; *plos*

The authors of TG, 466 proposed to restore a 1.pl. Prs from this root in A 349 a
2: *was wil lun(āmäs)*, and Sieg/Siegling were undoubtedly led to this
suggestion by the fact that TA *wil*, the meaning of which is unknown, also co-
occurs with TA *lawat-äṃ* in A 108 a 5 (they were finally followed by Schmidt,
1974, 45 with fn. 6). Although TB has a present of Class III and not one of
Class VI, Prs VI in TA would not be unlikely, because the TB paradigm is, in
fact, irregular (see chap. Prs III/IV). The 3.pl. Pt *lawar* ("frg.") can be found on
the small fragment THT 1410 frg. k b 3 (M. Peyrot, p.c.; Tamai, 2007a, s.v.).
The Ipv TA *pälwār* in A 433 a 8 does not belong to this root, but to ᴬ*luˀ-* 'rub
off'; see Schmidt, 1974, 45f., fn. 7. Sᴇᴍ. The verb is always transitive, that is
even the TB present of Class III; see chap. Prs III/IV 26.2.1. Eᴛʏᴍ. To be
derived from PIE *√leu̯H 'abschneiden, lösen' (²LIV, 417; Adams, DoT, 555f.).
For the formation of the lengthened-grade Prs III, see chap. Prs III/IV 26.5.3.

luk⁽ᵃ⁾- '(auf)leuchten, hell werden', 'light up, be illuminated' (itr) (m/-/a)

      Prs III (m) -,-, *lyuketär;—* Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub V — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf *lukatsi* (sic)
      Pt I (a) -,-, *lyukā-me;—*
      PPt in *lalaukarne*
      Ipv —

The Inf *lukatsi* is arguably attested in PK Cp 40 b 5 (Pinault, 1994b, 102), so the
subjunctive has persistent initial accent. The verbal noun *lalaukarne* belongs
to a PPt of a Pt I with a 3.sg.act. †*lauka*.

Aɴᴛɪɢʀᴜɴᴅᴠᴇʀʙ act./mid. 'erleuchten', 'illuminate', mid. 'light up, be
      illuminated' (tr/itr) (x/m/x)

      Prs VIII (x) -,-, *lukṣäṃ;-,-, lukseṃ* | -, *lukṣtar,-;-,-, luksentär*
          Imp -,-, *lukṣi;—*
          nt-Part —

        m-Part *luksemane*

        Ger I — Abstr I —

    Sub II (m) -,-, *lyuśtär*,— Opt —

        Ger II — Abstr II *lyuśilñe* Priv —

        Inf *lyuśsi*

    Pt III (x) -,-, *lyauksa/lyeͧksa*;-,-, *lyaukar* |

        -,-, *lauksāte* (MQ); *lyuksamnte*,-,-

    PPt *lyelyūku* | *lyelyukoṣ*

    Ipv —

The (transitive) 3.sg.mid. Sub *lyuśtär* is attested in PK AS 16.6A a 2 (see Couvreur, 1954, 86 and Schmidt, apud Hackstein, 1995, 124, with fn. 47); the 3.pl. Prs *lukseṃ* listed in TEB I, 175, § 298,2, without ref. may be attested in THT 1455 a 3: //// *swañcai* (sic) *lukseṃ* //// (for *swāñcaiñ* (?): "the rays illuminate"). The meaning of the isolated *m*-Part *luksemane* in 619 a 4 is unclear. The 3.sg. Pt variant *lyeͧksa* is found in THT 1179 frg. a b 4, the 3.pl. Pt *lyaukar* in PK NS 34 b 1 (Pinault, 1988a, 188), the 1.pl.mid. Pt III *lyuksamnte* in PK AS 14B a 5 (Couvreur, 1954, 90; on the ending, see Peyrot, 2008, 158), and the 3.sg. Pt *lauksāte* in St. 42.2.1 (= IOL Toch 285), a text with MQ character and archaic ductus. The middle PT forms seem to be intransitive; see below. According to Couvreur, 1961a, 101, an Abstr *lyͧuśilñesa* 'by brilliance' is reflected by the form *lšylyn'sh* in Manichean script found in Man.Bil. 17 (= U 100, v. 3; see most recently Pinault, 2008a, 99). The PPt *lyelyukoṣ* is attested in 514 a 6.

= ^A*luk-* '(auf)leuchten, hell werden', 'light up, be illuminated' (itr) (-/-/m)

    Prs — Imp —

        nt-Part —

        m-Part

        Ger I — Abstr I —

        Inf —

    Sub — Opt —

        Ger II — Abstr II —

    Pt 0 (m) -,-, *lyokät*;-,-, *lyokänt*

    Pt —

    PPt —

    Ipv —

ANTIGRUNDVERB + KAUSATIVUM II 'erleuchten', 'illuminate' (tr) (a/-/a)

    Prs VIII (a) -,-, *lͧukäṣ/lͧukuṣ*;-,-, *lukseñc-äṃ* Imp —

        nt-Part —

        m-Part *luksamāṃ*

        Ger I — Abstr I —

        Inf —

    Sub — Opt —

        Ger II — Abstr II —

    Pt III (a) -,-, *lyokäs*;—

    Pt II (a) -,-, *lyalyuk*;—

    PPt *lyalyuku/*lyalyuku* in *lyalyukuräṣ*

Ipv —

Schmidt, 1999b, 281 and 283 correctly pointed out that TA *lyalyuk=waṣtu* in YQ 2 a 6 does not attest to a PPt TA *lyalyuku*, but to a 3.sg. Pt II TA *lyalyuk*. However, a PPt variant TA *lyalyuku is nonetheless presupposed by the Abs TA *lyalyukuräṣ* in YQ 3 a 2; see chap. PPt 14.1.2. TA *lyalyku* seems to show loss of the root radical *-w-, and so do possibly also the TA Prs VIII forms *l̥ukäṣ, l̥ukuṣ*.

Sᴇᴍ. The middle forms from this root show a quite remarkable behavior. As a rule, in Tocharian middle forms from any given stem that are used intransitively in anticausative function do not get used simultaneously in other functions typical of a Tocharian middle; there are only very few exceptions to this rule and this root ranks among them; see chap. Voice 5.2.3. (another root showing such rare behavior is *mänt*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'stir, destroy', see s.v.). The middle Pt *lauksāte* in St. 42.2.1 b 1 is certainly intransitive, i.e., anticausative as well, the 1.pl.mid. Pt *lyuksamnte* can also be taken for a passive (see Hackstein, 1995, 124). The non-finite TA *luksamāṃ* has probably also intransitive meaning; see Hackstein, 1995, 126. Eᴛʏᴍ. From PIE *√leu̯k 'aufleuchten, hell werden' (²LIV, 418f.; see Hackstein, 1995, 126ff. in detail with ref. and Adams, DoT, 556). The TA root preterit and the TB/TA Pt III forms seem to go back to a preterit with Narten ablaut (see chap. Pt 0), and the Sub II to the thematic PIE root present (differently, Kim, 2007, 190 derives the latter from the PIE root aorist subjunctive). On deverbal nouns with preserved lautgesetzlich PT *läk⁽ʷ⁾- from pre-PT *luk-, see Kim, 2007b, 90 with ref.

lut- act. 'entfernen, vertreiben', 'remove, expel', mid. 'überschreiten', 'sich entfernen(von)', 'cross', 'go out (from), leave' (tr/itr) (x/x/x)
Prs IXa (x) *lyutaskau,-, lutaṣṣäṃ;-,-, lyutasken-ne|*
      -,-, *lutastär;-,-, lutaskentär*
      Imp —
      nt-Part *lutaṣṣeñca*
      m-Part —
      Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub II (x) —; *lyutem-c, lyuccer,- | -,-, lyutätär* (sic);—
      Opt -,-, *lyucī-ne;*—
      Ger II — Abstr II *lyucalyñe* Priv —
      Inf *lyutsi*
Pt III (x) *lyautwa,-, lyautsa-ñ;-, lautso* (sic), *lyautar|*
      lyutsāmai (MQ), *lyutstsatai,-;-,-, lyutstsante*
PPt —
Ipv —

The manuals refrain from determining the class of the subjunctive stem, but the newly attested Abstr II *lyucalyñe* in KVāc 24 a 2 and the 2.pl. Sub *lyuccer* clearly point to Class II; see Schmidt, 1986, 56, 92 and 140 and Hackstein, 1995, 244f. The 2.pl. Sub *lyuccer* is attested in PK AS 15C b 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 1.sg. Pt *lyautwa* in PK AS 13E a 2

(Couvreur, 1954, 89). The 3.sg.mid. *lyutätär* in 328 a 1 (S) is the equivalent of Skt. *prakramiṣyati*, as per TochSprR(B); on the spelling, see chap. Sub II 19.1.2.

= ᴬ*lut-* 'entfernen', 'remove' (tr) (a+/a/-)

        Prs VIII (a+) —;-,-, *lutseñc* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *lutäsmāṃ*
                Ger I *lutṣäl* Abstr I —
                Inf *lutässi*
        Sub VII (a) *lyutñam,-,-;—* Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II/III in
        PPt *lyalyutu*
        Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs TA *lutseñc* is attested in PK NS 2 b (?) 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; also listed by Couvreur, 1956, 97f. without exact signature). The Sub TA *lyutñam* is found in YQ 16 a 6. TG, 466 doubted whether one can indeed restore a PPt TA *lyalyu(tu)* in A 76 b 2 and a TA *lya(ly ͡u)t(u)* in A 312 b 7, but these restorations were accepted again by Sieg, Übers. II, 28 fn. 6, and TEB II, 29, fn. 8. Judging by the averbo, one would expect a Pt III stem, but the PPt makes one suspect that the Pt III had been replaced by a Pt II stem; see the discussion in chap. Pt III 9.1.6.2.

Kᴀᴜꜱᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ IV 'entfernen lassen', 'let remove' (tr) (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub IX — Opt —
                Ger II *lutāṣäl* Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 124 and Geng/Laut/Pinault, 2004, 362 read a Ger TA *lunāṣäl* in YQ 10 b 1 and translate: "He who selects for himself the householdership, he will be the one to cause confusion to the good ones". Paleographically, the form can also be read as TA *lutāṣäl*, which would indeed be a form of the Sub IX to be expected for a corresponding kausativum paradigm, whereas TA *lunāṣäl* would be a morphologically odd form. However, the analysis as a form of the subjunctive stem is also somewhat problematic, because one would expect a Ger I in this passage, i.e., a form built from a present stem.

Sᴇᴍ. The middle (only attested in TB) can be construed with an obliquus such as *salyai* 'border of the country', and in this case has the meaning 'cross'; on the other hand, the middle can also be construed with an ablative and in this case it has the meaning 'go out/away (from)', leave' (e.g., in 18 a 2), that is, shows the same intransitive meaning as *lä-n-t-* 'go out' (with which it is

related etymologically) and clearly functions as anticausative. In TA, the verb is usually found together with the noun TA *mnu* 'considerations', and this phrase has the meaning 'get confused' (cf. Hackstein, 1995, 243); the TA verb can also have the special notion 'cancel (a debt)'; see Thomas, 1993, 208 with fn. 157. Etym. From PIE *√h₁leu̯dʰ 'steigen, wachsen' (²LIV, 248f.; Hackstein, 1995, 245ff.); the lautgesetzlich result of the zero-grade allomorph of this root is continued in the forms from the root *lä-n-t-* 'go out'. *lyaut-* seems to go back to pre-PT *(h₁)lēu̯dʰ-, *lyut-* to pre-PT *(h₁)leu̯dʰ-, whereas *lut-* may just owe its initial *l-* to analogical depalatalization of PT *l'äwt- from pre-PT *(h₁)leu̯dʰ-. Note that the TB preterit with Narten ablaut cannot be traced back to a PIE aorist with such an ablaut for the fact that in PIE, the aorist from this root clearly has been rather (3.sg.) *h₁ludʰ-e(t); on the other hand, PIE may have had a Narten present/imperfect stem from this root, but then the TB Sub II might suggest that pre-PT had rather inherited a thematic root present *h₁leu̯dʰ-e/o- from PIE (according to Hackstein, 1995, 245f., the Sub II goes back to the subjunctive of the PIE root aorist and not to a present of the τρέφω type, which would, of course, require that PIE subjunctives could turn into Tocharian subjunctives); so maybe it is best to assume that the preterit with the PT ablaut *l'æwt-/*l'äwt- started out as an inner-Tocharian innovation based on the analogical proportion pre-PT Prs *leu̯k-e/o- : Pt *lēu̯k-/*leu̯k- = Prs *leu̯dʰ-e/o- : x, x = Pt *lēu̯dʰ-/*leu̯dʰ-. At any rate, inflectionally and semantically the paradigm from this root behaves like an antigrundverb to a grundverb *lä-n-t-* 'go out'.

ᴬ*lutk⁽ᵃ⁾?-* 'make, turn into' → *klutk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'turn, become'

lup⁽ᵃ⁾- '(be)schmieren, beflecken', '(hinein)werfen', 'rub, smear; besmirch, sully', 'throw into' (tr) (m/a/x)
    Prs VIII (m) -,-, *lupṣtär*; — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I *lupṣalle* Abstr I —
    Sub V (a) *laupau*,-, *laupaṃ*; — Opt -,-, *laupoy-ne*; —
        Ger II — Abstr II *lauwalñe* Priv —
        Inf *laupatsi*
    Pt I (x) —;-,-, *laupāre* | -,-, *laupāte*; —
    PPt *lalaupau*
    Ipv —

The 3.sg. Sub *laupaṃ* is attested in the small fragment THT 1629 frg. k b 2 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). Instead of Inf *lopatsi* (thus, e.g., WTG, 285) one has to read the expected Inf *laupatsi* in Fill. W 34 b 3, as per Couvreur, 1954, 87. As for *[lo]pāte* in 109 a 5 (thus WTG, 285), the akṣara in question is damaged, so that one can similarly restore the form to *[l](au)pāte* (as per TochSprR(B), s.v., fn. 11). It is highly unlikely that *lauw[tä]* in 205 a 5 (MQ) is a 2.sg. Sub of this verb (cf. WTG, 127, § 123, fn. 4). The subjunctive has persistent initial accent.

Whether one can restore a PPt of Pt IV *(lalaupä)ṣṣusa* in 85 a 1 remains uncertain (see most recently Schmidt, 2001, 313 with fn. 66).

= *^Alup^ꜣ-* 'beflecken', 'besmirch' (tr) (—)

      Prs — Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —
             Inf —
      Sub V — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II *loplune*
      Pt I in
      PPt *lālupu*
      Ipv —

SEM. The verb has the concrete meaning 'rub, smear' (e.g., in Fill. W 31 b 3: *āśne lupṣalle* "has to be rubbed onto the head"), and the figurative meaning 'besmirch, sully' (in 33 a 7: *wrocce lupṣtär nākimpa* "he is sullied with a great fault"; TA *sne loplune* in A 217 b 6 being the equivalent of Skt. *na liptaḥ* 'unblemished'; on the passage, see Thomas, 1968a, 198f.). Once the verb is construed with the perlative, and in this case it seems to mean '± throw into', as proposed by Sieg/Siegling in 31 b 1 = (32 a 4): *ceṃ ksa yāmtär appamāt wrocce lupṣtär nraisa* "(wenn) diesen [= einen Arhat] einer verächtlich macht, wird er in die große Hölle geworfen" (see most recently Carling, 2000, 72; the sense intended here cannot simply be that the one offending becomes merely 'besmirched', because according to Buddhist doctrine, insulting an Arhat leads inevitably to rebirth in hell). All clear middle forms seem to be passives. ETYM. According to Adams, DoT, 558, the root is to be derived from PIE *√(s)leu̯bʰ 'gleiten, schlüpfen' (²LIV, 567 without Toch.).

TA *let-* → *^Alit^(a)-* 'fall'

ley- 'loslösen (?)' → *liy^(a)?-* '± wipe away'

lait- → *lit^ꜣ-* 'fall'

^Alotk^ꜣ- 'turn' → *klautk^(a)-* 'turn, become'

TA *lop-* → *^Alup^ꜣ-* 'besmirch'

LY

lyäk- 'liegen', 'lie (down)' (itr) (a+/a/-)
>　　　Prs II (a+) -,-, *lyaśäṃ;-,-, lyakeṃ* Imp —
>　　　　　nt-Part —
>　　　　　m-Part *lykemāne* (MQ)
>　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
>　　　Sub II (a) *lyakau,-,-;* — Opt -,-, *lyaśi;* —
>　　　　　Ger II — Abstr II in *lyśalyñeṣṣe* Priv —
>　　　　　Inf —
>　　Pt —
>　　PPt —
>　　Ipv —

According to Winter, 1983, 324, *lyakau* in 345 a 4 is not a PPt (thus WTG, 285; TEB II, 237), but a 1.sg. Sub. Whether *lyat* in the fragmentary passage 606, 1 is a 2.sg. Sub of this stem remains unclear (this is doubted in WTG, 126, § 122, fn. 2; similarly Pinault, 1989a, 164f., who interprets the form as a noun); in favor of subjunctive argues Winter, 1983, 324, who derives it from *ˀlˀäśät. *lyakeṃ* in 516 b 2 that does not have a clear context is also ambiguous; formally, it can also be an obl.pl. of the otherwise attested noun *lyake* '?'. Isolated *elykatte* in the small fragment THT 1271 a 2 looks precisely like a privative based on a kausativum Sub V stem *lyäkā-; alternatively, the form may belong with *läk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'see'.

Possibly the verb is also attested in TA (apart from the related noun TA *lake* 'resting place' = *leki* 'id.'), viz. by the PPt TA *lalku* in A 12 b 5, as is proposed by TG, 464. We would be dealing with a PPt formed to a (transitive) Pt III 'make lie (flat)'. On the other hand, the same form can also be analyzed as metrically shortened variant of a PPt of *ᴬläṅk-* 'hang, dangle'; see the discussion s.v. *ᴬläṅk-*. Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from PIE *√legʰ 'sich (hin)legen' (²LIV, 398f.); Adams, DoT, 566. Ringe, 2000, 129f. derives the thematic subjunctive and present stem from the PIE root aorist subjunctive (for a possible *legʰ-i̯e/o-, see also Ringe, l.c., fn. 27). As a matter of fact, the intransitive active thematic root present of Tocharian has a perfect match in the Cypriot (Paphian) intransitive active thematic root imperfect καλεχες transmitted in Hesychius and there glossed with κατέκεισο.

lyi(n)ᵃ- '± plazieren', '± place' (?) (—)
>　　Prs V/VI — Imp —
>　　　　nt-Part —
>　　　　m-Part —
>　　　　Ger I *lyinālle* Abstr I —
>　　Sub — Opt —
>　　　　Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
>　　　　Inf —
>　　Pt —
>　　PPt —

Ipv —

This Ger I is attested at least four times: in Fill. W 32 a 2; Fill. M 3 a 7, a 8, and b 1. Sieg, 1955, 82 read *lyitālle*; this *lyitālle* was interpreted as belonging to a causative paradigm (with non-kausativum morphology!) of the root *lit^a-* 'fall' by TochSprR(B), glossary, 165 and WTG, 283. In contrast, Filliozat, 1948, 76, 94 and Couvreur, 1954, 91 read *lyinālle*. Adams, DoT, 554f. adopts the reading *lyinālle* and sets up a separate root *li(n)-* '± place' correctly pointing out that this gerundive is transitive while the other forms said to belong to a causative paradigm of *lit^a-* by Krause are not. As for the reading, I rather agree with Filliozat and Couvreur. To be sure, there is in general no great difference between the signs ⟨na⟩ and ⟨ta⟩ in the Weber manuscript, but the slight difference that does exist enables us to state with some certainty that the form in W 32 a 2 indeed has to be read *lyinālle*. I would, on the other hand, not venture a guess as to which reading is the correct one in Fill. M. As for the semantics, Adams' proposal '± place' (of some nuance that eludes us) makes probably better sense than 'let fall down': Fill. M 3 a 7 *t(aka) erkaune lyinālle* is translated by Sieg, 1955, 82 "(wer aber den Wunsch hat, zwei Genossen in Streit zu lassen, soll zwei menschliche Skelette unter dem Namen dieser beiden siebenmal besprechen), [die Skelette] jedoch auf die Leichenstätte (?) fallen lassen" (Carling, 2000, 116f. correctly points out that the use of the locative singular in this passage is quite remarkable, because *erkau* 'graveyard' is used in similar passages in the perlative or allative plural). The meaning of this passage has hence to be that both skeletons should be placed on one single grave (some kind of wooden platform, according to Hilmarsson, 1991b, 149ff. and 152), so that 'let fall down' is obviously not a fitting translation. The other passages also go well with simple 'place': Fill. M 3 a 8 *sanatse twerene lyinālle sāṃ nakṣträ* "it has to be *placed* on the door of the enemy, the enemy will be destroyed"; Fill. M 3 b 1 *tverene lyinālle* "has to be *placed* on the door". The subject of the gerundive in Fill. M 3 a 8 is *śāmñe yāṣe* 'needle of human (bones)" (cf. Filliozat, 1948, 102), in Fill. M 3 b 1 it is *yartaṣe śer(k)* "string made of *yart*" (reading and translation according to Sieg, 1955, 82). The fourth attestation in Fill. W 32 a 2f. is without clear context (neither Filliozat nor Sieg, 1955, 76 translate the passage). Finally, *litale* (sic) in Fill. W 42 a 6, which is also construed with the locative, should also be mentioned, because its usual interpretation of a Ger of *lit^a-* 'fall' meets the same problem of a different root ablaut: *piyene litale* "has to be … in *piya*" (cf. Sieg, 1955, 78). In terms of morphology, a stem *lyinā-* could be a Prs V from a root *lyin-* or a present VI from a root *lyi-*, and as per WTG, 71, § 75, fn. 4, *lyin-* from *l'äytn- is also possible, so that in the end a connection with *lit^a-* cannot be excluded at all.

lyu- 'rub' → *lu-* 'id.'

^A*ly^a-* 'wipe away' → *liy^(a)?-* 'id.'

lyyā- 'wipe away' → *liy^(a)?-* 'id.'

W

^{A}**waṅk-** 'chat' → ^{A}*wāṅk^a-* 'id.'

walāk^a- 'stay, abide' → *wālāk^a-* 'id.'

^{A}**waly-** 'bedecken', 'cover' (?) (—)

  Prs I — Imp —
    nt-Part *walyänt*
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
    Inf —
  Sub — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II —
  Pt —
  PPt —
  Ipv —

Clear hapax in A 292 a 7, a passage that deals with the 27th *lakṣaṇa* (attributes) of the Buddha: //// *(ṣo)lāraṃ poñcäṃ akmalṣi mañ walyänt wär(ts knuṃts käntu)* ////: "la langue mince, large recouvrant toute la lune de la figure jusqu'au (front)"; see Pinault, 1999, 216, and also Couvreur, 1946, 593 and 1956, 72 for TA *walyänt* as equivalent of Skt. *avacchādayati* 'covers'. Apart from the Sanskrit parallel, there is now also the Old Turkish parallel MaitrHami (XXVI) B b 20-22 (for which see Pinault, l.c., and Geng/Klimkeit/Laut, 1998, 136: "die die gesamte Gesichtsfläche bedecken"). TA *w(a)ly(ä)nt* can in addition plausibly be restored in A 151 b 2 (cf. TG, 467), where it is without further context. See also ^{AB}*wāl^a-* 'cover'.

^{A}**wā-** 'lead' → *wāy^a-* 'id.'

wāk$^{(a)}$- 'sich spalten, aufblühen', 'split apart, bloom' (itr) (m/a/-)

  Prs IV (m) —;-,-, *wokontär* Imp —;-,-, *wokyentär*
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub V (a) -,-, *wākaṃ*; — Opt -,-, *wāko͢ẖ*; —
    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
    Inf *wākatsi* (MQ)
  Pt I in
  PPt *wawākauwa| wawākaṣ*
  Ipv —

The Inf *wākatsi* is attested in the small fragment THT 1536 frg. c + frg. e a 5 (MQ), and the 3.pl.mid. Imp *wo[k]y[e]ntṟạ* probably in THT 1314 b 6.

Antigrundverb mid. 'sich unterscheiden', 'differ' (itr) (m/-/-)

  Prs VIII (m) -,-, *wākṣtär-ś*; — Imp —
    nt-Part —

     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
 Pt —
 PPt —
 Ipv —

The 3.sg. mid. Prs is also attested in the small fragment THT 1319 a 4, where it may also have the meaning 'differ': //// *tusa śaiṣṣene wākṣtạr ṣes[k]e ////* "thus in the world ... differs solely". Another attestation can be found in THT 1711 b 2 without further context.

KAUSATIVUM II 'aufblühen lassen', 'let bloom' (tr) (-/-/a)

  Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub IXb — Opt —
     Ger II *wakṣālle* (sic)/*wakṣälle* (MQ) Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
 Pt IV (a) -, *wākäṣṣasta* (MQ),-; —
 PPt —
 Ipv —

Instead of the expected Ger †*wākäṣṣälle*, we have *wakṣä(lle)* in H add.149 110 b 2 (without clear context; the text seems to have MQ character; see Broomhead I, 257 and Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 234) and *wakṣälle* in Fill. W 12 a 5 (next to other Ger II forms): "hair is to blossom" (cf. also Broomhead I, 14, who wrongly edits *wakṣalle*).

= ᴬ*wāk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'sich spalten, bersten', 'split apart, break apart, burst' (itr) (-/a/x)

  Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
  Sub V (a) -,-, *wākaṣ*;— Opt —
     Ger II *wākal* Abstr II —
 Pt 0 (m) -,-, *wākät*;—
 Pt I (a) -,-, *wāka-ṃ*;—
 PPt —
 Ipv —

The 3.sg. Sub V TA *wākaṣ-äṃ* in YQ 15 b 1 does not have to be emended (as claimed by Hackstein, 1995, 129, fn. 72), since this is actually the form to be read here. The restoration to TA *wāk(a-ṃ)* in A 134 b 3 (thus TG, 468) is plausible, because the form precedes TA *nkalunyaṃ kälk* "went into ruin". According to Hackstein, 1995, 132, one should uphold the reading TA *wākä[t]* of TochSprR(A) in A 455 a 5 against TA *wākä[s]* as read by TG, 468, and the

visible traces of the akṣara indeed strongly point to ⟨ta⟩ and not to ⟨sa⟩, so we are dealing with a Pt 0 (the form is without any further context).

ANTIGRUNDVERB act. 'spalten', 'take apart', mid. 'sich unterscheiden', 'differ'
       (tr/itr) (m+/a/a)
       Prs VIII (m+) -,-, *wākäṣtär;* — Imp —
             nt-Part *wākṣantāṃ*
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —
             Inf —
       Sub VII (a) *wākñam,-, wākñäṣ;* — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt III (a) —;-,-, *wākär*
       PPt —
       Ipv —

The active 3.sg. Prs TA *wākäṣ* listed in TEB I, 176, § 299,2b is probably only reconstructed (or due to a restoration of TA *wākä* //// in A 178 a 5, which, however, can also be restored a middle present or to a preterit form); TA *wākär* A 213 b 6 is analyzed as 3.pl. Pt III of this root in TG, 468; A 213 b 6 has now a direct parallel in YQ 14 b 2, where Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 94, fn. 16 take TA *wākär* to be rather an adverb than a verbal form. To be sure, one would expect a Pt III of this structure from this root, and such a form would also make sense syntactically; see also Hackstein, 1995, 130.

SEM. The middle forms of the antigrundverb are construed with the ablative and have the meaning 'differ from', so we are dealing with intransitive forms and a middle in anticausative function. See also Hackstein, 1995, 128ff. for the passages. ETYM. PIE *√u̯eh₂ĝ/g 'brechen, zu Bruch gehen' (²LIV, 664); see Hackstein, 1995, 132; but see also the discussion in Dettori, 1999, 293ff. with ref. reconstructing the root rather as *√u̯ag.

^A*waṅk^ä-* 'schwatzen, scherzen', 'chat' (itr) (m/-/-)
       Prs IV (m) -,-, *waṅkatär;* — Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part *waṅkmāṃ*
             Ger I — Abstr I —
             Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

On the evidence of the *m*-Part TA *waṅkmāṃ* (attested twice) the sole finite form TA *waṅka(–)* in A 265 b 1 can only be restored to a middle Prs IV TA *waṅka(tär)* (cf. TG, 467): A 265 b 1 *kareṣ waṅka(tär)* "he laughs and chats". The meaning 'chat' is now also supported by the Old Turkish parallel to A 265 b 1, i.e., MaitrHami (XIII) 1 b 4 (identified by Pinault, 1999, 201; the Old

Turkish text is edited by Geng/Klimkeit/Laut, 1991, 285). ᴇᴛʏᴍ. We are most likely dealing with a denominative, cf. TA *waṅke* 'chitchat'.

ᴬ**wāt^ä-** '± stoßen, bohren', '± thrust, stab' (tr) (a/-/-)

    Prs VI (a) — Imp -,-, *wātñā*;—
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

Hapax in A 295 a 3: //// *sälpmāṃ triśul mäṣ kapśiññaṃ tsākñā wātñā* ////. The same passage is also attested in YQ 36 a 6, where only the beginning is preserved. Although we are undoubtedly dealing with MSN, the exact chapter and hence a possible Old Turkish parallel version cannot be identified yet (cf. Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 206f., fn. 3). Schmidt, 1974, 21, fn. 4 proposed the following translation (by reading *triśul <l>mäṣ* instead of *triśulmäṣ*; but see now s.v. ᴬ*läm*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sit' and below): "... setzt er den glühenden Dreizack, in den Körper stach [and] stieß (?) er ...". Differently, Carling, 2000, 220: "ein glühender Dreizack leuchtete tief in (?) dem ... Körper". TA *mäṣ* (not TA †*lmäṣ*) — a form Carling interprets as an adverb with the meaning 'tief (?)' — is strongly backed by the parallel YQ 36 a 7, where the word separation is certain. On the other hand, for morphological reasons it is not very likely that TA *tsākñā* belongs to ᴬ*tsāk*- 'glow', but rather to ᴬ*tsak^ä*- 'pierce' (see s.v.), so that the passage should probably be translated as: "he pierced [and] thrust (?) the glowing trident deeply (?) into the body". ᴇᴛʏᴍ. The respective Pt I †*wāt* could derive from a Narten preterit *$u̯ed^hH$-t (*√$u̯ed^hh_1$ 'stoßen', ²LIV, 660).

[*wānts-* '?', this root is set up by WTG, 286 for the alleged preterit form *wantsa-ne* in PK AS 13I b 6, but there one has to read *auntsate* (→ *au-n-* 'hit') instead; see Pinault, 2007, 176f.]

wāp^ä- 'weben, flechten', 'weave, braid' (tr) (-/m/a)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V (m) -,-, *w(ā)p(a)tär*;— Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf *wāpatsi*
    Pt I (a) -,-, *wāpa*;—
    PPt *wawāpau*
    Ipv —

There is some discussion concerning the correct restoration of *w(·)p(·)tär* in 3 b 5: TochSprR(B) and WTG, 286 restore a Prs *w(o)p(o)tär*, while Couvreur, 1954, 83 and Thomas, apud ²TochSprR(B), 145 restore a Sub *w(ā)p(a)tär* for syntactical reasons; to be sure, since the verbal form is transitive, a Prs III form would indeed be very unlikely. Whether *wp(·)lle* in H 149.210 a 1 can be restored to a form of this root is unclear. It is without context, and Broomhead's restoration (Broomhead I, 316) *wp(e)lle* would imply a Ger I from a present of Class III, which is at variance with the long root vowel that would imply Prs IV and with the transitive valency; even thought the script of H 149.210 a 1 is mostly rubbed off (see now IOL Toch 56), I would nevertheless expect some traces of a vowel sign, so that *wp(a)lle* is the most likely reading (see also the discussion about a root allomorph *wäp- below). The subjunctive has persistent initial accent.

= ^{A}***wāp^a-*** 'weben, flechten', 'weave, braid' (tr) (-/-/m)

      Prs — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
           Inf —
      Sub V — Opt —
           Ger II *wāpalyi* Abstr II —
      Pt I (m) -,-, *wāpat;—*
      PPt —
      Ipv —

Thanks to the YQ manuscript we now have the Ger II TA *wāpalyi* (YQ 21 b 1), the 3.sg.mid. Pt TA *wāpat* (YQ 21 b 4), and the abstract TA *wāpāṃtsune* 'weaving' (YQ 21 a 8). For the stem allomorph TA *wäp-*, see below. The PPt TA *wopu* in A 288 b 6 (thus TG, 469) can now safely be emended to TA *wo<r>pu* 'surrounded' on evidence of the Old Turkish parallel version (identified by Pinault, 1999, 193); this emendation was already suspected by Sieg (apud Thomas, 1978, 123). The Old Turkish parallel MaitrHami (I) 7 a 23ff. reads (in translation): "Badhari, der weise ..., und er wurde umgeben [von] den übrigen 500 Brah[manen]; mit gebeugtem [Körper faßte] er die Hand des Maitreya and [sprach] mit milden Worten folgendermaßen" (Geng/Klimkeit, 1988, 81); accordingly, A 288 b 6: //// *wo<r>pu nmosāṃ kapśiñño bādhari brāhmaṃ • meträkyāp tsarā* //// "surrounded (by the other brahmins) the Brahmin Bādhari with bowed body (seized) the hand of the Maitreya ...".

Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from PIE *√u̯eb^h 'umwickeln, weben' (²LIV, 658; rather *√h$_{2/3}$u̯eb^h; cf. Hajnal, 2002, 201ff.); see Adams, DoT, 586. There are some inner-Tocharian problems with respect to stem formation and root vocalism. The TA equivalent of the TB stem *wāpā-* 'weave' was set up as TA *wäp-* by the manuals (TG, 469; WTG, 286; TEB II, 140). However, the TA forms showing a stem TA *wäp-* are uncertain with respect to meaning, and since there now exist certain TA forms made from the expected stem TA *wāpā-* 'weave', I separate TA *wäp-* from this root (see below). On the other hand, the weak-

stem allomorph *wäp-* is indeed attested in the TB noun *wpelme* 'cobweb', which certainly belongs to the 'weave' root. So it is not unlikely that we have to do with a root of the type *pik^ä-*, i.e., a basic root **wäp^ä-* that generalized the full grade in the subjunctive/preterit. Under this assumption, *wp(a)lle* in H 149.210 a 1 (if read correctly) may belong to the weak-grade present stem of the root, though being without context, it can as likely belong to an A-characterless root ^A*wäp-* '?'. In sum, since no certain zero-grade verbal form is attested, I set up the 'weave' root as *wāp^ä-* (not "*wep-*" as done by Eyþórsson, 1993, 49, fn. 19, because *wepe* 'corral, paddock' is formed according to a productive process).

^A*wāmp^B?-* 'schmücken', 'decorate' (tr) (m/-/m)

      Prs II (m) -,-, *wamtär* (sic); — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt I (m) *wāmpe,-,-;* —
      PPt *wāmpu*
      Ipv —

The root must have inflected like *sāmp^(a)-*/ ^A*sum^(a)-* (with the exception that the Prs must have been of Class II, because of the root vowel *-a-* instead of *o* > *u*), i.e., PT **-ā-* must have been originally restricted to the preterit. See also *wämp?-* '?'.

wāy^ä- 'führen, lenken', 'lead, guide, drive' (tr) (-/x/x)

      Prs — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub V (x) -,-, *wayaṃ* (MQ);-,-, *wāyaṃ* Opt -,-, *wāyoy;* — |
          wāyoymar,-,-; —
          Ger II *wāyalle* Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf *wāyatsi*
      Pt I (x) -, *pāyāsta* (sic, MQ), *wāya;-,-,* *wayāre* | -,-, *wayāte;-,-,* *wayānte*
      PPt *wawāyau* | *wawāyaṣ*
      Ipv I (m) *pwāyar-me;-*

The 3.sg.mid. Opt *wāyoytär* listed in TEB I, 228, § 412,1 is probably only reconstructed. A Ger II *wāyalle* is attested according to Couvreur, 1954, 87 without ref. The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. A 2.pl.act. Pt *wāyas* is further only listed in TochSprR(B), glossary, 169 without ref., and since the form cannot be correct either (one should have expected †*wayās*), it is not listed here. *āk-* 'lead' provides the suppletive present stem.

= ^A*wā-* 'führen, lenken', 'lead, guide, drive' (tr) (-/x/m)

        Prs — Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf —

        Sub V (x) -,-, *wātär;*— Opt *wāwim,-,-;*—

                Ger II *wāl* Abstr II *wālune*

        Pt I (m) -,-, *wāt;-,-, wānt*

        PPt *wāwo*

        Ipv —

^A*āk-* 'lead' provides the suppletive present stem; but see also ^A*we-* 'sprout'. The 3.sg.mid. TA *wātr-äṃ* is attested in THT 2069 b 1 (see Carling, DThTA, s.v. *āk-*). On the optative stem TA *wāwi-*, see Hilmarsson, 1994, 101ff., and chap. Opt 23.2.3.
S<small>EM</small>. There is no noticeable semantic difference between active and middle forms (cf. Schmidt, 1974, 385ff.). E<small>TYM</small>. See Adams, DoT, 36f. with ref., and in addition Hilmarsson, 1994a, 99; this will be a denominative either from a *μoi̯(H)o/eh$_2$- or a *h$_2$ṷodh$_2$i̯eh$_2$-.

^A*wār*^{B?}- 'erwachen', 'wake up' (?) (—)

        Prs — Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt I in

        PPt *wāwru*

        Ipv —

It is likely that the root has A-character.

wārk^B- 'scheren (Schafe)', 'shear (sheep)' (tr) (-/-/a)

        Prs — Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub V — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II *warkaṃñe* (sic) Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt I (a) —;-,-, *warkāre*

        PPt —

        Ipv —

warkaṃñe in the small fragment 303 frg. f is without context, but can morphologically be interpreted as an Abstr II (for regular [†]*warkālñe* or rather

†*wārkalñe*) of this root, thus WTG, 286; Adams, DoT, 579. The TA forms that are given as cognates of this TB root by the manuals all rather belong either to *Awärk?*- 'work' or to *Awärk?*- 'turn' (see s.v.).

wārp[ā?]- 'umgeben', 'surround' (?) (−)

        Prs — Imp —
               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
               Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
               Inf —
        Pt I in
        PPt *wawārpau* | *wawārpaṣ*
        Ipv —

= *Awārp*[a?]- 'umgeben', 'surround' (?) (−)

        Prs — Imp —
               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I — Abstr I —
               Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
               Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II in
        PPt *worpu*
        Ipv —

For TA *worpu*, see chap. Pt II 8.1.1., fn. 2.

ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√ụerbʰ 'enclose'; see Driessen, 2001, 41ff.; Hackstein, 2003, 181. A-character and a root vowel -*ā*- is only suggested by the TB forms.

Awārp[ā?]- 'urge oneself' → *wārw*[ā?]- 'id.'

wārw[ā?]- 'sich anspornen zu', 'prod, urge oneself' (itr) (-/-/m)

        Prs — Imp —
               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
               Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
               Inf —
        Pt I (m) -,-, *warwāte*;—
        PPt —
        Ipv —

KAUSATIVUM I 'anspornen, anstreben', 'spur on, prod, urge' (tr) (a/a/-)

        Prs IXb (a) -,-, *wārwäṣṣäṃ*; — Imp —
                nt-Part *wārwäṣṣeñca*
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub IXb (a) — Opt *wārwäṣṣim*,-,-; —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

= ^{A}*wārp$^{ä?}$-* 'sich anspornen zu, verlangen nach', 'urge oneself' (itr) (-/-/m)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I (m) -,-, *wārpat*; —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

TA *wārpat* in A 20 a 6 was analyzed as Pt of this root (although without translation) by TG, 468. Differently, Sieg, Übers. I, 24, fn. 11 and Couvreur, 1956, 79 analyze the form as imperfect from ^{A}*wärp^ä-* 'enjoy': A 20 a 6 *ptāñkte ñom klyoṣā wārpat ñi pältsäk kāswoneyac* "ich hörte den Namen des Buddha, mein Geist empfand Verlangen nach der Tugend" (Sieg, Übers. I, 24). Although a strong Imp TA *wārpat* is phonologically possible, the analysis of the form as Pt from this root by TG, 468 is, nevertheless, the superior one, because a construction with allative like in this passage is indeed attested with TB *wārw$^{ä?}$-* 'prod' as well, and since we are further dealing with non-remote past tense ("aktuelle Vergangenheit"; see Thomas, 1956, 199ff.), a preterit, and not an imperfect is expected. A form TA *wārpat* is without much context also attested in THT 1483 frg. a a 2 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.).

KAUSATIVUM I 'anspornen', 'prod, urge' (tr) (—)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *wārpäsmāṃ*
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub IX — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *wārpäṣlune*
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. The meaning 'spur on' is based on the *nt*-Part in K 11 b 6f.: *srukalyñeṣṣ=īme waṣamo nauṣ tākaṃ wārwäṣṣeñca ṣek* "[wenn] das Gedenken an den Tod [schon] vorher der stets anspornende Freund ist" (Sieg, 1938, 52; Dietz, 1981, 68). Eᴛʏᴍ. The PT shape of the root is *wārp(ā)-. While TB *p* > *w* is an eastern and informal sound change (see basically Winter, 1955, 218ff. = 2005, 3ff.; Schmidt, 1986a, 640), in this case we find -*w*- persistently, that is, also in texts that do not seem to come from the eastern region (although the provenance of the Hoernle text and of the Paris text are unknown, both do not show eastern features, and it is very unlikely that these two collections include manuscripts from the Turfan oasis at all). Accordingly, Adams, DoT, 587, suggests that we are dealing with a special sound law in this case, i.e., *p* > *w* after "long vowel followed by a resonant", which he says also triggered *waiwā*- 'be wet' < PT wāypā-; however, the formerly homonymous root PT wāypā- 'surround' does not show that kind of change (*werwiye* 'garden' for **werpiye* is an informal-style form). It is possible that the formal styles introduced -*w*- from the informal ones in order to distinguish the homonymous roots 'surround' and 'prod', both of which are most likely roots with A-character. Adams' analysis as a denominative built from a **werpe* '± lash, stick' is the best available.

wāl^B- 'bedecken, umhüllen, verhüllen', 'cover, surround, conceal' (tr) (m/x/m)
    Prs VI (m) *walanamar*,-,-; — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I *walanalle* Abstr I —
    Sub V (x) -,-, *walatär* (MQ); — Opt -,-, *wāloy-c* (MQ);-,-, *waloṃ* (MQ) |
        -,-, *wāloytär*; — Ger II — Abstr II *wālalñe* Priv —
        Inf *wālatsi*
    Pt I (m) *walāmai*,-,-; —
    PPt *wawālau* | *wawālaṣ*
    Ipv —
The 1.sg.mid. *walanamar* is attested in IOL Toch 785 a 1 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.). The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. The nom. PPt *wawālau* is to be restored in 321 b 2 and 575 a 2 (as per TochSprR(B)), and probably also in the small fragment IOL Toch 436 a 1 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.).
= *^A wāl^B-* 'bedecken, umhüllen, verhüllen', 'cover, surround, conceal' (tr) (-/-/x)
    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt I (x) -,-, *wāla-ṃ*; — | -,-, *wālat*;-,-, *wālant*
    PPt *wāwlu*
    Ipv —

SEM. The middle forms are passives, with the exception of at least the 1.sg. Pt
walāmai in 27 b 8, where the function of the middle is unclear. ETYM. To be
derived from PIE *√u̯el(H) 'einschließen, verhüllen' (²LIV, 674 without Toch.);
see Hilmarsson, 1991, 46, and Hackstein, 1995, 302f. with fn. 44. Rather not
with Adams, DoT, 588 from *√u̯el 'wind, twist', which is more likely
continued in *wäl?-* '± bend'; see s.v.

wālāk͏ᵃ- 'sich aufhalten', 'stay, abide' (itr) (m/-/-)
   Prs I (m) *wolokmar,-, woloktär;-,-, wolokentär* Imp -,-, *wolośitär;* —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —
The 3.pl.mid. Prs *wolokenträ* (sic) is attested in PK AS 7K a 2 (Couvreur, 1954,
83), showing an analogical thematic 3.pl. ending. ETYM. Diachronically, we are
dealing with a present of Class IV; see Adams, 1988, 401ff.; DoT, 581; and
chap. Prs III/IV 26.3.

wālts͏ᵃ- 'zerstampfen, mahlen', 'crush, grind' (tr) (a/a/a)
   Prs VI (a) —;-,-, *waltsanan-me* Imp -,-, *waltsanoy-ne;* —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I *waltsanalle* Abstr I —
   Sub V (a) -,-, *waltsa-ñi* (MQ); — Opt -,-, *wāltsoy;* —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf *wāltsasi*
   Pt I (a) *waltsāwa,-, wāltsa; waltsām,-, waltsāre*
   PPt *wawāltsau*
   Ipv —
waltsanan-me (probably 3.pl.) is attested in THT 1332 a 3 (M. Peyrot, p.c.). A
form *wa(ltsna)n* is restored in 255 a 7/b 1 by TochSprR(B) and analyzed as
3.pl. Prs of this root by WTG, 287. However, I doubt that the still visible left
part of the first lost akṣara can possibly be an ⟨l⟩; on the difficult passage, see
the discussion s.v. *śāw-* 'live'. The Inf is often attested in administrative
documents from the Paris collection; see Pinault, 1994b, 95f. The subjunctive
has persistent initial accent. The 1.sg. Pt *waltsāwa* is attested in PK Cp 27 b 3
(unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).
KAUSATIVUM IV 'mahlen lassen', 'let grind' (tr) (-/-/a)
   Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —

Ger I — Abstr I —

Sub — Opt —

    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

    Inf —

Pt IV (a) —; *wāltsaṣam* (sic),-,-

PPt —

Ipv —

The causative 1.pl. Pt is often attested in administrative documents from the Paris collection, as per Pinault, 1994b, 95f.; cf., e.g., PK Cp 21, 8: *ysāre wāltsaṣam*ˎ "we had the grain ground". On the preservation of the stem-final -*ā*- (not †*wāltsäṣṣam*), see chap. Pt IV 10.1.2.3. Etym. Either a denominative or an *o*-grade *eh₂*-stem based on PIE *√(h₂)u̯elh₂ 'strike' (Hitt. *walaḫzi*), as per Adams, DoT, 589.

wāsk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich regen, sich bewegen, beben', 'stir, move, quake' (itr) (m/-/m)

    Prs XII (m) -,-,*wäskantär* (Š)/*wāskäntär* (MQ)/*waskantär*/

        wäskäntär (MQ);—

        Imp —

        nt-Part —

        m-Part —

        Ger I — Abstr I —

    Sub V — Opt —

        Ger II *wāskalle* (MQ) Abstr II — Priv *awāskatte*

        Inf —

    Pt I (m) -, *waskātai*, *waskāte*;-,-, *waskānte*

    PPt *wawāskau│ wawāskaṣ*

    Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. variant *wäskänt␣rä* is attested twice in MQ texts (143 b 1 and H 149.add 124 a 6; on the latter text see Thomas, 1971, 39f.); H 149.add 124 in addition shows the form written as *wāskänt␣rä* in line a 3. A further variant *wäskantär* is attested in a standard text from Šorčuq, and *waskant␣rä* in U 18 b 2, a text that does not seem to be an MQ text either. So, we have to do with two stem variants *wāskäññ*- and *wäskäññ*- (cf. Peyrot, 2008, 154), because in an MQ text, /ä/ is normally not rendered by ⟨ā⟩ (cf. Peyrot, 2008, 34; note that since we have ⟨ā⟩ and not merely ⟨a⟩, we also cannot simply be dealing with omission of the *ä*-dots). Hilmarsson, 1991, 39ff. and 1991a, 77f. argues that the root is parallel to *mänt⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'stir, etc.' and should therefore be set up as *wäsk⁽ᵃ⁾*-, the *ā*-vocalism having spread from the subjunctive. However, since -*ā*- is also found in the kausativum and is the only root vowel attested in TA, I nevertheless maintain the traditional root shape. The Ger II *wāskalle* is found in THT 1264 a 2, the 3.pl.mid. Pt *waskānte* in THT 1431 frg. b b 2 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.), the nom.sg. PPt *wawāskau* in PK NS 18 b 3, and the obl. PPt *wawāsk(aṣ)* in PK AS 17G a 2 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

Kausativum I 'wegbewegen', 'move away' (tr) (-/a/-)

        Prs — Imp —
              nt-Part —
              m-Part —
              Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub IXb (a) -,-, *wāskäṣṣäṃ;*— Opt —
              Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
              Inf *wāskästsi*
        Pt IV in
        PPt *wawāskäṣṣu*
        Ipv —

The 3.sg. *wāskäṣṣäṃ* in 331 a 1 is subjunctive, according to Winter, 2003a, 107 = 2005, 530, and has the meaning 'moves away'; the Inf is attested in THT 1647 frg. j b 1 without any context, and the nom.sg.fem. PPt *wawāskäṣṣusa* is found in PK NS 18 a 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

= ᴬ*wāsk⁽ä⁾-* 'sich bewegen, beben', 'move, quake' (itr) (m/-/m)

        Prs VII (m) -,-, *wāsäṅkātär;*-,-, *wāsäṅkāntär* Imp —
              nt-Part —
              m-Part —
              Ger I — Abstr I —
              Inf *wāsäṅkātsi*
        Sub V — Opt —
              Ger II — Abstr II *wāsklune*
        Pt I (m) -,-, *wāskat;*—
        PPt *wāwäsku*
        Ipv —

Since there are only middle forms attested from this root (including the restored one in A 259 a [recte b] 2, on which see Geng/Laut/Pinault, 2004a, 45 with fn. 95, and two more found in the unpublished texts THT 1976 a 2 and THT 2465 a 2, cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.), the 3.sg. TA *wāsäṅkā(–)* in A 337 b 9 (prose) should be restored to a middle form as well (differently, Couvreur, 1956, 85; for the reading, see TochSprR(A), "Nachträge", 257 ad p. 185).

Kausativum I 'aufrühren, beben lassen', 'stir up, let shake' (tr) (—)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
              nt-Part —
              m-Part —
              Ger I — Abstr I —
              Inf *wāskässi*
        Sub — Opt —
              Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt IV in
        PPt *wāwäskṣunt*
        Ipv —

The object of the Inf TA *wāskässi* that is attested in the small, unpublished Berlin fragment THT 1153 b 3 is TA *tkaṃ* 'ground', cf. Thomas, 1969, 263, fn. 1 (without ref.); the object of the PPt is 'water'.

SEM. On the passages, see Melchert, 1978, 108f., and Hackstein, 1995, 197ff.
ETYM. According to Hackstein, 1995, 199f. with ref., the root continues the PIE
iterative present stem *uĝʰ-sk̂e/o- from PIE *√u̯eĝʰ 'move' (²LIV, 661:
'schweben; fahren'); on the other hand, Melchert, 1978, 108f., followed by
Adams, DoT, 589f., rather opts for deriving the Tocharian verb from a PIE root
*√u̯eGʰ 'shake, set in motion' distinct from *√u̯eĝʰ (not in ²LIV). The *ā*-
vocalism of the root is in any case most likely due to *ā*-umlaut from the
subjunctive stem *wāskā- < *wæskā-; see Hilmarsson, 1991, 39ff. (who
proposes yet another etymology).

wäks⁽ᵃ⁾- '± sich abwenden', '± turn away' (itr) (m/-/-)
        Prs III (m) -,-, *wäksetär*;-,-, *wäksentär* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I in
        PPt *wäksoṣne*
        Ipv —
KAUSATIVUM I '± zur Abkehr bringen', '± make turn away' (tr) (a/-/a)
        Prs IXb (a) — Imp -,-, *waksäṣṣi-me*; —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt II (a) -, *wyāksasta*,-; —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 1.sg. *waksäṣṣi-me* (arguably an imperfect) is attested in PK AS 16.9C a 3
(unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The 2.sg. Pt *wyāksasta*
is to be read in 204 b 2, according to Schmidt, 2000, 226, and 231 contra
TochSprR(B): *pernerñe[sa] wyāksasta*. SEM. WTG, 287 translates the root with
'beunruhigt sein' (with question mark); Adams, DoT, 590 proposes '± be
restless, wander', but the most likely translation is '± sich abwenden' given by
Schmidt, 2000, 231, because the verb is construed with the ablative or the
adverb *lau* '(a)far'. The PPt is without context, the 3.pl.mid. Prs *wäksenträ* is
found in the difficult Buddhastotra 255 b 3ff.: *isälyäntse {p}ṣertwentsā cowai
käntwa tärkänaṃ ma cpi nesäṃ pärki* (or *märki*) *su wäṣṣe weṣṣäṃ
<o>nolmeṃ • tesa śaiṣṣe wäksenträ ālyauwcemeṃ ce preke aumiyene
pälskoṣṣe (mā) kälpasträ emälyai* "By inciting jealousy, he loses the tongue, is
without *pärki* (or *märki*), [and] lies to the beings. Thus (is) the world; they
turn away from one another at this time, [not even] in feverish thinking he

gets fervent" (cf. Schmidt, 1974, 195 for the last part of the passage). The 3.sg.mid. *wäksetär* is attested in 331 b 1f. (concerning Pāt 74, i.e., the rule about accepting alms for no longer than four months from a single householder): *nano nano preksemane tākaṃ tanāpatentse palsko lau wäksetär träṅkossu mäsketär* "[if] (the monk) again [and] again is begging (scil. for alms after four months), [and] the mind of the householder turns away, [then] he (scil. the monk) becomes guilty", cf. Schmidt, 1974, 158 (who by that time still followed the semantic proposal of WTG for *wäks-*) and Dietz, 1981, 122. Etym. Probably a denominative from a noun *uĝʰ-s-eh₂- itself derived from PIE *√u̯eĝʰ 'move' or *√u̯eGʰ 'shake, set in motion', as per Adams, DoT, 590.

wäṅk- '± (Essen) zubereiten, anbieten', '± prepare, offer (food)' (tr) (-/-/m)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt IV (m) -,-, *wäṅkṣāte-ne*; —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
Hapax in H 149.X 5 (= HMR 3) a 5: *oskai wayāte-ne • śwātsi wäṅkṣāte-ne* "he lead her into the house [and] ± offered/prepared for her food" (cf. Couvreur, 1954a, 46 and Broomhead I, 74ff., who wrongly reads *weṅk-*; see now Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 248).

wät^{ᴮ?}- 'kämpfen', 'fight' (?) (m/-/a)
        Prs I/II/VII? (m) -,-, *witär*; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *watalyñe* Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I (a) —;-,-, *witāre*
        PPt —
        Ipv —
Couvreur, 1954, 84 proposed to read a 3.sg.mid. *witär* in 282 a 4: *aṅkain placsa se wīträ* "mit der falschen Rede kämpft er (?)"; this interpretation has the advantage of relating the form to a known root, whereas TochSprR(B) and WTG, 300 had to work with *sewīträ* from an otherwise unattested root *sew-* 'leiden (?)'. The form may be either Sub I or Sub II; and although a mere misspelling for *wi<c>tär* or a Prs VII *wi<n>tär* cannot be excluded (W. Winter, p.c.), *witär* is probably simply the regular reflex of PT *w'ät(')ätär (as apparently assumed by Hackstein, 1995, 244 with fn. 112), cf. -*tk*- < pre-PT

*-täsk- and also -*s*- < *-s(ä)s- in *wäsātai*, etc. The abstract is attested in KVāc 15 a 5: *[w]e[ta] wa[t]a[l](yñe)* "Kriegshandwerk (?)"; see Schmidt, 1986, 47, 78. The subjunctive stem is more likely to be analyzed as Class V than Class I, because A-character is also suggested by the nominal forms derived from this root. *watalyñe* may then either show initial accent or be a misspelling for †*watālyñe* (KVāc displays some incorrect writings). SEM. The valency is unclear, because *ālyauce* in 21 b 7 *witār=ālyau(ce)* "sie bekämpften einander" may be used as an adverb. ETYM. TA only has the related noun TA *wac* 'fight' (= TB *weta*). To be derived from PIE *√u̯edʰ 'strike (down)'; see Adams, DoT, 590 (rather *√u̯edʰh₁ as per ²LIV, 660; without Toch.). I propose to explain the allomorph *wit-* from PT *wäyt- as being due to a metathesis of palatalization of having occurred in an Early PT *w'ät-; see chap. Sound Laws 1.7.

ᴬ*wät⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'setzen, stellen', 'put, place' (tr) (a+/-/-)
   Prs VI (a+) *wnām*,-,-; — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part *wnāmāṃ*
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt I in
   PPt *wto*
   Ipv —
The present forms are attested in YQ 4 a 6 and YQ 42 a 3.
KAUSATIVUM III 'errichten, (aufrecht) hinstellen', 'erect, place (upright)'
   (tr) (-/-/a)
   Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt II (a) —;-,-, *wotār*
   PPt *watunt*
   Ipv —
The kausativum does not seem to have causative semantics: A 63 a 4 *wotār ārkyant wätsyās* "sie stellten große weiße Sonnenschirme auf" (see Schmidt, 2004, 310 with ref. to the Sanskrit parallel version; the other preterit forms in this passage are not causatives either).

wätk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich entscheiden', 'entscheiden', 'entschieden sein', 'verschieden sein',
   'decide', 'be decided', 'differ' (itr) (-/x/a)
   Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —

           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V (x) — Opt -, *wätkoyt,-;* — | —; *wätkomtär,-,-*
           Ger II in *wätkālyce* Abstr II *watkālñe* (sic) Priv —
           Inf —
    Pt I (a) *wätkāwa,-, wätkā* (MQ); —
    PPt *wätkau/watkowä* (sic) | *wätkoṣ*
    Ipv —

The 1.pl.mid. Opt *wätkomtär* is found in PK AS 17E b 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), a 2.sg.act. Opt *wätkoy[ta]* arguably also in THT 3273 a 1: *wätkoy[ta] ta* //// (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). The 1.sg. Pt *wätkāwa* is attested in PK NS 31 a 3, the MQ form 3.sg. Pt *wät(k)ā* in PK AS 12K b 6 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). *wätkālyce(ṃ)* in S 6 (= PK AS 5 C) a 4 has the meaning 'decided' (see Thomas, 1966a, 175 and Pinault, 1990a, 62 and 66); the Abstr *watkālñe* (sic, misspelled for †*wätkālñe*) is attested in THT 1270 a 1 in fragmentary context beside *tsrālyñe* 'separation, apartness', so it probably has the meaning 'difference'. The PPt *wätkoṣ* in 88 b 2 has the meaning 'separated (from)' (Schmidt, 2001, 317f.), *wätkau* in 108 a 7 'decided' (Thomas, 1957, 254 and Saito, 2006, 194f.). Pace Winter, 1965, 208 = 2005, 124, the PPt *wätkau* does not belong to the *s*-preterit of the antigrundverb, but is the expected PPt to the *ā*-preterit. The verbal noun *wätkāl* is used in the function of an adverb, the derived adj. *wätkāltstse* has the meaning 'decided, definite, different' (cf. adj. TA *wätkālts* 'decided, definite'). *wätkāl* in 284 b 7 means 'das Entscheidende', according to WTG, 288 (cf. also the similar translation by Couvreur, 1954c, 111). The PPt variant *watkowä* (sic, misspelled for †*wätkowä*) is attested in H 150.42 a 5 (Broomhead I, 345; Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 255). On the Priv *aitka(tte)*, see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.2.

Antigrundverb 'trennen', 'entscheiden', 'separate', 'decide' (tr) (-/a/a)
        Prs — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub I + II (a) -,-, *wotkäṃ;-,-, wotkeṃ* Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf —
    Pt III (a) -,-, *otkasa-me* (sic); —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

The 3.pl. Sub *wotkeṃ* is attested in PK AS 7 K a 2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.); the form must be thematic, whereas the 3.sg. Sub *wotkäṃ* attested in 255 a 6 (MQ) is clearly athematic, and it is precisely the thematic 3.pl. ending *-eṃ* that is most easily introduced into athematic paradigms; see chap.s Prs I and Sub I; the *o*-vowels in both forms are certain (although the editors of 255 put the *[o]* in brackets, no other reading is possible), so a reading **w[e]tkäṃ* as proposed by Eyþórsson, 1993, 57, 37 is

neither possible nor to be preferred, because root vowel *o* instead of *e* is also attested in the Sub II and in the Pt. Since *w* is lost by sound law before *o* in TB, the preterit has the result of (*)*wo-* by sound law, and the subjunctive forms have analogically persevered or restored *w-*; the *o* is due to former reduplication; see chap. Pt III 9.2.1. and Sub I/V 18.7.1.1.1. On the Sub I *wotkäṃ* in the difficult pāda 255 a 6, see the discussion of the entire passage s.v. *śäw-* 'live'; note that in the parallel text 254 a 5 the pāda ends with the verb: //// *(wo)[tkäṃ •]*. Here also belongs the adv. *wetke* '± away' ← **wetke* 'separation' (cf. Adams, DoT, 608).

KAUSATIVUM II 'befehlen', 'command' (tr) (a/a/a)

      Prs IXb (a) *watkäskau, watkäst, watkäṣṣäṃ/ watkaṣäṃ* (MQ)/

            wätkāṣäṃ (MQ);-, *watkäścer-ñ,-*

            Imp -,-, *watkäṣṣi*; —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I *watkäṣle* Abstr I *wätkäṣṣälyñe* (sic)

      Sub IXb (a) — Opt -,-, *watkaṣṣi* (sic); —

            Ger II — Abstr II *watkäṣlñe* Priv —

            Inf —

      Pt II (a) *yātkawa, yātkasta, yātka*;-,-, *yātkare*

      PPt *yaitku| yaitkoṣ*

      Ipv II (a) *pitka*; *pitkaso*

The manuals analyze the Abstr I *wätkāṣṣälyñesa* in 251 b 2 and the 3.sg. Prs *wätkāṣäṃ* in H 149.add 123 b 3 as Prs IXa forms, which should further belong to the grundverb. However, *wätkāṣṣälyñesa* translates Skt. *śāsanena* 'command' (instr.sg.), and is hence clearly a kausativum. As is discussed in chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.4., this form and others showing the suffix *-ăsk-/-ăṣṣ-* are simply relic forms preserving A-character. The Ger I *watkäṣle* is attested in KVāc 20 a 4 (Schmidt, 1986, 53). For morphological reasons, PPt *yaitkoṣ* in 520 a 4 rather belongs to the kausativum and hence has the meaning 'commanded' instead of "geteilt" (pace Saito, 2006, 196). An Ipv *(pi)tk(a)so* is, according to WTG, 288, and Thomas, ²TochSprR(B), 151, to be restored in 7 a 3. A very archaic PT stem **w'ætkå-* is presupposed by *yotkolau*; see chap. PPt 14.2.

= ᴬ*wätk*⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich trennen', 'getrennt sein', 'entschieden sein', 'separate (itr)', 'be separated', 'be decided' (itr) (m/-/a)

      Prs III (m) *wätkamār,-,-*; — Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

            Inf *wätkatsi*

      Sub V — Opt —

            Ger II in *wätkālts* Abstr II *wätkālune*

      Pt I (a) -,-, *wtäk*; —

      PPt *wätko*

      Ipv —

The forms have the following semantics: TA *(wä)tkamār* in A 74 b 3 'separate';
TA *wätkatsi* in YQ 42 b 4 'to separate' (Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 78f.); TA *wtäk*
in A 58 b 5 "entschieden" (Sieg, Übers. II, 10); TA *wätko* in A 92 a 2 judging by
the preceding PPt TA *tsro* 'separated' has arguably also the meaning
'separated' (cf. Saito, 2006, 194), and the same is true for A 107 b 1, because
there the PPt is correlated with TA *pkänt* 'separated'; TA *wätkālune* in A 82 a
1 is without much context, and so is TA *watkāṣ-äm* in A 410 a 2, which TG,
469 proposed to emend to a Sub V TA **watkaṣ-äm*, but this form is more
likely an error for Sub IX *wätkāṣ-äm*, i.e., due to a mere omission of the *ä*-dots.
The middle Sub V form TA *wätkāmār* listed in Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 277 is
due to a former restoration in YQ 12 b 8, which had been abandoned in favor
of TA *wätkā(ltsuneyo)* in the actual edition (G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The adj. TA
wätkālts derived from the Ger II has the meaning 'decided, definite' (cf. TB
wätkāl, *wätkāltstse*).

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'trennen', 'entscheiden', 'beantworten', 'separate (tr)', 'decide',
        'answer' (tr) (-/a/a)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub IX (a) -,-, *wätkāṣ*,-,-, *wätkāseñc* Opt —
                Ger II *wätkāṣäl* Abstr II —
        Pt III (a) *wackwā*,-,-; —
        PPt *watkuräṣ*
        Ipv —

The 3.sg. Sub TA *wätkāṣ* (A 213 b 5) and TA *wätkāṣṣ-äm* (A 213 b 3; YQ 14 b
4) seem to have the meaning 'answer', according to Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998,
90ff., cf. A 213 b 3 + YQ 14 a 7f.: *kuprene säm yasäṃ caṣ penu pärklune • sne
(tä)ṅklune atäṅkät wätkāṣṣ-äm* "if this one (is able to answer) these questions
asked also by you (immediately and without hesitation)". Differently,
Thomas, 1990, 55: "wenn er auch dieses euer Fragen (ohne Hemmung [und]
ungehindert euch bestimmt [entscheidet, zu unterscheiden vermag])";
similarly Schmidt, 1994b, 260 ("bestimmt"). The Old Turkish parallel
MaitrHami (II) 6 a 8ff. reads in translation: "wenn er dieses derartig von euch
Gefragte zu unterscheiden geruht", "D.h. wenn er die Fragen im Herzen zu
erkennen vermag" (Geng/Klimkeit, 1988, 133 with fn. 37). The two other
subjunctive forms are construed in a kind of figura etymologica with TA
wätkālts 'decided': YQ 14 b 1 (= A 213 b 5): *wätkāṣ wätkālts* "will answer
firmly"; YQ 14 b 4: *kᵤprene säm penu sne täṅklune wätkālts wätkāṣṣ-äm* "if
this one also gives his answers to you without hesitation and firmly" (both
translations according to Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 91ff.). The fourth finite
attestation of the subjunctive, TA *wätkāseñc* in A 33 a 5, is without context.
The Abstr TA *wätkāṣäl* in A 16 a 3 is translated by Sieg, Übers. I, 19 with fn. 11
with 'Edikt', being "eine zu entscheidende Sache"; Thomas, 1952, 14ff. points
out that a form by that meaning should rather have been derived from the

present stem, but this is morphologically impossible. For that reason, Stumpf, 1971, 28, with fn. 23 proposes to translate "ein Problem [wörtl. eine Sache], [das nur] durch einen solchen König entscheidbar [war]". TA *wackwā* in A 31 b 6 most likely means 'separate, detach': *kucne ysār wackwā kapśiññä(ṣ)* "when I separated/detached blood (or: that I separated/detached blood) from the body". The Abs TA *watkuräṣ* in A 317 a 7 (not in TG, 469) can only belong to a PPt **watku* formed to the Pt III 'having decided', cf. the translation by Saito, 2006, 194 (without morphological discussion; note finite *-ck-* pointing to pre-TA **w'ætk-* vs. *-tk-* in the PPt pointing to pre-TA **wæwætk-* rather than **w'æw'ätk-*).

KAUSATIVUM II 'befehlen', 'command' (tr) (a/-/a)

        Prs VIII (a) *wätkäsam,-, wätkäṣ;-, wätkäś* (sic), *wätkseñc* Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part *wätkäsmāṃ*

                Ger I *wätkṣäl* Abstr I —

                Inf *wätkässi*

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt II (a) *wotkā-ṃ, wotkaṣt, wotäk/wotka-m;-,-, wotkar*

        PPt *wotku*

        Ipv II (a) *putäk/pūtkā-ñi;-*

All clear attestations have the meaning 'order, command' (A 6 a 4; A 20 b 2; A 71 b 4; A 95 a 4; A 96 b 4; A 117 b 4; A 342 a [= b] 2; A 394 a 3; without much context are A 127 a 1; A 164 a 6; A 280 b 1, and the restored form in A 408 b 5). TEB II, 140 also lists a subjunctive stem of Class IX with the meaning 'command' (TA *wätkāṣ* without ref.), but this may only be due to formal considerations. The PPt TA *wotku* replaced a more archaic TA *watku* still preserved in the meaning 'command'. The original preterit-stem inflection is that of Class II; on contraction, occurrence of vowel balance and seemingly consistent Class I inflection, see chap. Pt II.

SEM. The different meanings are discussed separately in each paradigm. The averbo given here deviates from the one given in the manuals. The root has three different verbal stems. The one with the meaning 'command' is the morphologically expected kausativum, and does not constitute a separate root (cf. Melchert, 1978, 112). In TA, all three stems have clearly different semantics. In TB, the Prs IXa also seems to have the meaning 'command' that is otherwise only met with the kausativum. It is interesting to note that there are no certain instances of present forms of the antigrundverb that show the expected meaning 'separate (tr), decide'. The Sub I *wotkäṃ* may be construed without object, but since concurrence of Class I and Class V subjunctive stems made from the same root is always linked with valency opposition (at least with respect to active forms), Sub I is to be interpreted as a stem of the antigrundverb. ETYM. According to Melchert, 1978, 113, the root is to be derived from the PIE present-stem formation **u̯i-dʰh₁-sḱe/o-* from the root **√dʰeh₁* 'set'. Hackstein, 2002, 8 with fn. 21 proposes an alternative etymology **PIE **uth₂-sḱe/o-* from PIE **√u̯eth₂* 'speak', but still favors the one by

Melchert. Hackstein, l.c., fn. 21 furthermore objects to the etymological
derivation from PIE *h₂ud-sk̂e/o from PIE *√h₂u̯ed 'lead' proposed by
Jasanoff, 1978, 111 and Rasmussen, 1989, 53 for semantic reasons. At any rate,
we have to start with a PT *wätk- that was taken for the zero grade of a root
with full grades PT *w'ätk- and *w(')ætk-, much as *mäsk- from pre-PT *misk-
was taken for the zero grade of a root with full grades PT *m'äsk- and
*m(')æsk-; see s.v. *mäsk-* 'exchange'.

***wänt*ᴮ-** 'umhüllen', 'cover' (tr) (a/-/-)
        Prs VI (a) —;-,-, *wäntanañ-c* (MQ) Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
        Pt I in
        PPt *wantau* (MQ, sic) | *wäntoṣ* (MQ)
        Ipv —

Beside the MQ form, a 3.pl. *wäntanan-ne* is also attested in PK NS 21 b 4
(prose), according to Thomas, 1979, 168. The manuals (WTG, 288; TEB I, 200, §
358) list a Sub I or Sub II 3.sg. *wäntär* and an Inf *wäntsi* from this root, but
since the Prs VI and the TA Sub V attest to A-character, Ringe, 2000, 131, fn. 30
doubts that these forms belong to this root at all. *wäntär* attested in the
notoriously difficult passage 255 a 6 is indeed totally unclear and may not be a
verbal form at all; see the discussion of the entire passage s.v. *śäw-* 'live'. The
context of the alleged Inf *wäntsi* in H 149.316 b 3 is also completely unclear,
and Broomhead I, 286 reads *wät[ts]i* and not *wäntsi* in the first place (see now
also Peyrot, s.v. IOL Toch 105; both readings are paleographically arguable). It
is hence possible to set up a separate, A-characterless root *wänt-* '?' for these
forms (the alleged *s*-preterit 3.sg. *wantsa-ne* said to be attested in PK AS 13I b
6 by WTG, 286, is no further comparandum, because the form has to be read
auntsate instead; see Pinault, 2007, 176f.). Beside the misspelled MQ form
wantau, a correctly written fem. PPt *wäntausa* is found in IOL Toch 804 b 2
(Peyrot, 2007, s.v.).

= ᴬ***wänt*ᴮ-** 'umhüllen', 'cover, envelop' (?) (—)
        Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
        Sub V — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II *wäntālune*
        Pt I in
        PPt *wänto*
        Ipv —

ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√u̯endʰ '(um)winden' (²LIV, 681f.): see Adams, DoT, 592.

*A*wäpᵃ- '?' (itr) (m/-/-)
       Prs III (m) — ;-,-, *wpantär* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

According to TG, 469, the following forms are built from a root *A*wäp-: 3.pl.mid. Prs TA *wpantä* in A 284 a 3, 3.sg. Pt TA *wpäs* in A 75 a 6, and PPt TA *wopu* in A 288 b 6. However, the PPt has to be emended to TA *wo<r>pu* on account of the Old Turkish parallel version; see s.v. *A*wāpᵃ- 'weave'. TG, 469 does not give a translation for the root, and WTG, 286 refers to TA *wäp-* as equivalent of the TB root *wāpᵃ-* 'weave'. Although the Sub/Pt has persistently TB/TA *wāpā-*, it is not excluded that TA *wpa-* is indeed an *ä*-grade present stem belonging paradigmatically to TA *wāpā-* 'weave' (we would be dealing with the *pikᵃ*-type, i.e., *ä*-grade present vs. persistent full-grade subjunctive/ preterit), and nominal *ä*-grade formations of the 'weave' root are also attested and indeed expected from an etymological point of view. Even though there is now an Old Turkish parallel attested for A 284 a 3 (identified by Pinault, 1999, 203), there is no exact equivalent in the Old Turkish version for the TA passage in question: A 284 a 3 *(klo)pant lk(ā)tsi •* mlantä *wpantä* //// "... to see these sufferings; they (= the people reborn in hell) are crushed together and ?". It is not excluded that we are indeed dealing here with a meaning 'weave' conveying a manner of torment, because perverting things and procedures from the domestic domain constitutes a basic part of the infernal tortures (see, in principal, Anderson, 2001, 59ff.), but it has to be admitted that the form remains doubtful. Finally, isolated TA *wpäs* in A 75 a 6 is totally unclear, and may not be a verbal form at all (cf. Sieg, Übers. II, 12, followed by TEB II, 26, fn. 5).

*A*wämᵃ- '± untergehen (Sonne)', '± set (sun)' (?) (—)
       Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
       Sub V — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II *wmālune*
       Pt —

```
        PPt —
        Ipv —
KAUSATIVUM ? '?' (tr) (-/-/a)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II (a) —;-,-, womār
        PPt —
        Ipv —
```

SEM./ETYM. The passage YQ 28 b 2 shows that the verb has the meaning 'set' with respect to the sun: *säs koṃñkät wmāluneyam yäṣ* "the sun is going down" (Ji/ Winter/Pinault, 1998, 36f.), cf. also the compound TA *koṃwmānt* 'sunset; west' (opposed to TA *koṃpärkānt* 'sunrise; east' and reminiscent of TB *kauṃ-yänmālle* 'sundown'; see Pinault, 1998a, 363). The only finite form comes from an unclear passage: A 237, 1 *(ś)āwaṃ ś(ā)(st)räntu wākmtsaṃ entsānt wom(ā)r* //// "they seized great, excellent Śāstras, they made set (?) ...". Whether the TB hapax *wämyu* in 282 a 4 is a PPt of the same root as proposed by Adams, DoT, 593 is uncertain: //// *śaiṣṣe se kleśanmaṣṣai wämyu räskre kāswasā*. Adams, l.c., translates: "this world is roughly covered by the leprosy [?] of kleśas", and compares Gk. δύομαι having the two meanings 'disappear into, sink in' and 'cover oneself with'. Differently, Winter, 1965a, 206 = 1984, 172f. = 2005, 131, refers to TA *wmār* 'jewel' (< *wämāwar), and hence sets up the original root semantics with 'glow'. Further connections are uncertain.

wämp?- '?' (?) (m/-/-)
```
        Prs IXa (m) -,-, wämpastär;— Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PP —
        Ipv —
```
Hapax in the unpublished text pieced together from the fragments PK AS 7M + NS 122a + NS 261 + NS 262 in line b 1 (pāda 25a; Karmavibhaṅga): *sn(ai) peñyai (l)k(ā)ṣṣäṃ | krākṣträ ersna wämpasträ* (reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; | indicates caesura). The text treats the characteristics of old age and death, so that a connection with [A]*wāmp?-* 'decorate', TA *wampe* 'decoration' does not make too much sense. Since the preceding stanza speaks

about poor eye sight, one may think that this passage also refers to eye sight becoming poor: "[the old one] sees ... without splendor; [the eye sight] becomes blurred, it blurs the forms"; for *krākṣträ*, see s.v. *krāk?-* '± become dirty, blurred (?)'.

wär- 'ausüben, betreiben', 'practice' (tr) (m/-/-)
      Prs IXb (m) -,-, *warästär*, — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part *waräskemane*
           Ger I *waräṣṣälle* Abstr I —
      Sub IXb — Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II *waräṣṣälñe* Priv —
           Inf —
      Pt II in
      PPt *yairu| yairoṣ*
      Ipv II (m) -; *pīrat*
An Imp or Opt form *waraṣṣī ////* is probably attested in the small fragment THT 3273 a 2. I analyze the Abstr as formation of the subjunctive stem, because abstracts are rarely derived from the present stem.
= *Awär-* 'ausüben, betreiben', 'practice' (tr) (-/a/-)
      Prs VIII — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part *wärsmāṃ*
           Ger I — Abstr I —
           Inf —
      Sub IX (a) — Opt —; *wrāṣimäs,-,-*
           Ger II *wrāṣläṃ* Abstr II *wrāṣlune*
      Pt II in
      PPt *wawru*
      Ipv II (m) -; *purāc*
The present stem is now attested by TA *wärsmāṃ* in YQ 19 b 8; see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 192f.
SEM./ETYM. According to Couvreur, 1942, 20f., the basic meaning is 'purify, meditate', from which 'practice' is derived secondarily, because morphologically he interprets this root as kausativum to *wär⁽ᵃ⁾(-sk)-* 'smell' by comparing Skt. *bhāvayati* 'practice, purify, perfume', which is often rendered by *wär⁽ᵃ⁾(-sk)-* 'smell'. The development would have been 'faire sentir' → 'parfumer', 'purifier', and then 'practice'. However, while this root would be the morphologically expected kausativum of *wär⁽ᵃ⁾-*, *wär⁽ᵃ⁾-* itself has an *sk*-extension *wärsk-* with complete syncope of the former stem-final -*ā*-.

Awär- '?' (?) (—)
      Prs — Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II in
        PPt *woru*
        Ipv —

The PPt TA *woru* is attested in A 213 a 5 (= YQ 14 a 2) and YQ 4 a 4; the passage A 213 a 5 = YQ 14 a 2f. deals with one of the 32 bodily marks (*lakṣanas*) of the Bodhisattva: TA *kāsu woru esnum* = Skt. *susaṃvṛttaskandha-* 'wohl abgerundete Schultern habend' (see Couvreur, 1946, 590f.; Thomas, 1990, 48; Schmidt, 1994b, 258); although the same *lakṣana* is also described with the closely resembling PPt TA *worku* in YQ 12 b 1 TA *(kā)su worku esnaṃ*, TA *woru* cannot be a mere misspelling for TA *worku* (for which see s.v. ᴬ*wärk?-* 'turn'), because TA *woru* is actually attested in two different manuscripts. TA *worku* 'turned' in YQ 12 b 1 is the literal translation of Skt. -*vṛtta-* (as per Hackstein, 1995, 81ff.), so that TA *woru* could be a more poetic one; Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 91 translate 'well-shaped'. In YQ 4 a 4 TA *woru* relates to an instrumental of TA *maitär* 'friendship' and refers to the eyes of Maitreya: *maiträyo worūnt aṣuk späntont tsen-yokāss a(śänyo)* "with his blue eyes full of friendship and totally confident" (Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 75); the Old Turkish parallel version has *yazok* as equivalent of TA *worūnt*, and this form "wird im Altuigurischen gerne zur Charakterisierung des Gesichtsausdrucks (vgl. *yazok yüzin* „mit entspanntem (offenem) Gesicht") verwendet"; see Wilkens, 2008, 425 with fn. 77 with ref. to a proposal by P. Zieme to translate *yazok* with "flach". This fits the translation 'make wide (?)' of the root ᴬ*wär-* in the glossary by Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 277 suggesting we have to do with a cognate of the adj. TA *wärts*/TB *wartse* 'wide'. If one is willing to separate TA *woru* in A 213 a 5 (= YQ 14 a 2) from TA *woru* in YQ 4 a 4, there are further possibilities for the interpretation. The Old Turkish parallel version has twice *tüšwi* 'hängend' for the *lakṣana* TA *kāsu woru esnum* (see Geng/Klimkeit, 1988, 309); though this does not necessarily mean that TA *woru* must have the same meaning, one could derive ᴬ*wär-* 'hang' from PIE *√h₂u̯er 'hang' (²LIV, 290 without Toch.). Finally, I would not exclude the possibility that TA *woru* in A 213 a 5 (= YQ 14 a 2) is a cognate of TB *wärnāmane* 'turning' (if this is not from *wärtᵃ-* 'turn'; see s.v.), and hence a literal translation of Skt. -*vṛtta-* as well. In the end, despite the Sanskrit and Old Turkish parallels, the basic meaning of TA *woru* remains uncertain, and so does even the question whether the two instances of TA *woru* belong to one and the same root ᴬ*wär-*.

wär⁽ᵃ⁾-/ wärsk- 'riechen', 'smell' (itr/tr) (x/-/m)
wär⁽ᵃ⁾- Prs/Sub I/II (m) (tr) -,-, *wartär*, — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —

      Sub V (itr) — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf *wrātsi*

wärsk- Prs II (a+) (itr) -,-, *warṣṣäṃ/ warṣäṃ-ne*;-,-, *warskeṃ* Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part *warskemane* (sic)
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub II (tr) — Opt —
          Ger II *warskalle* Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf *warstsi/ warssi*
      Pt I (m) (tr) —;-,-, *wärskānte*
      PPt —
      Ipv —

Adams, DoT, 596 quite plausibly analyzes *wa[rt]är* in 247 b 4 as Prs I/II from the unextended root: *//// (wa)[wa]kauwa pyapyaino wartto räm no wawarpo wa[rt]rä wa[s·] ////* "he smells the blooming flowers surrounding, as it were, the forest". Although TochSprR(B), s.v., fn. 5 states that *wa[rk]rä* is a possible alternative reading, judging by the original manuscript, I would say that *wa[rt]är* is indeed the correct reading (the angle of the right bend is far too wide for a ⟨k⟩). To be sure, the form can also be a subjunctive. For the stem *wär(ä)sk-, see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.6.2.2., and for the loss of *-ä- between -*r*- and -*sk*- W. Winter, apud Hackstein, 1995, 205, with fn. 3 and Ringe, 1989a, 37. The loss of that *-ä- then caused the initial accent attested in *warskemane* and *warṣäṃ-ne* in K 11 a 2; see Hackstein, 1995, 257f., and also chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.6.2.2. The *m*-Part *warskemane* is attested in PK NS 97 b 4 referring to *kanta*, arguably a loan from Skt. *gandha-* 'smell' (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). Hackstein, 1995, 256f. analyzes the Inf *warstsi* as a Sub I form, but this form can also perfectly well derive from the PT stem *wäräsk'ä/æ- set up by Hackstein himself. The Ger (II or I) *warskalle* is plausibly attested in the small fragment THT 2381 frg. k a 3 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.): *warskalle <u>m</u>asketa(r)*.

= ^A**wär-** 'riechen', 'smell' (tr/itr) (a/-/m)
      Prs VIII (a) (itr) -,-, *wräṣ*; — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt IV in
      PPt *wawärṣu*
      Ipv III (m) (tr) *pursār*;-

SEM. On the voice/valency pattern of seemingly active intransitive and middle transitive forms, see Schmidt, 1974, 185f.; 1992, 111f.; 1997c, 543f., and the discussion in chap. Voice 5.2.2.2. Pace Adams, DoT, 596, the Inf *wrātsi* in K 8 b 3 has intransitive meaning (thus WTG, 289; see Hackstein, 1995, 256): *(mā)k[a]*

*tāk[aṃ] (on)olmi tuntse no ṣarm tsa koynameṃ yolo were onolments aunasträ
wrātsi* "(wenn) viele Wesen (Lügner) sind, beginnt auch auf Grund davon aus
dem Munde der Wesen ein übler Geruch zu riechen" (reading, restoration,
and translation according to Sieg, 1938, 38). ETYM. Said to derive from PIE
*√u̯er 'beobachten, wahrnehmen' (²LIV, 685f.; Hackstein, 1995, 261ff.).

wärk²- 'wirken, tun', 'work, have an effect' (tr) (—)
   Prs VIII in *warkṣäl* Imp —
      nt-Part —
      m-Part —
      Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub — Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
      Inf —
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —
= *ᴬwärk²-* 'wirken, tun', 'work, have an effect' (tr) (—)
   Prs VIII in *wärṣṣäl/wärkṣäl* Imp —
      nt-Part —
      m-Part —
      Ger I — Abstr I —
      Inf —
   Sub — Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —
SEM./ETYM. See Hackstein, 1995, 78ff. The verbal abstract *warkṣäl*/TA *wärkṣäl*
has the meaning 'strength, force, power'. TA *wärkṣantāñ* and TA *worku*
belong rather to *ᴬwärk²-* 'turn' (see s.v.). To be derived from PIE *√u̯erĝ
'wirken, tun' (cf. ²LIV, 686f.); cf. Adams, DoT, 579f. Note that the stem PT
*wärks'ä- may after all derive from an inherited *u̯r̥ĝ-s- and not be based on
an inner-Tocharian innovation, given the fact that *u̯r̥ĝ-s- seems also to be
attested by Go. *waurstw* 'work'.

ᴬwärk²- 'drehen, neigen lassen', 'turn' (tr) (—)
   Prs VIII — Imp —
      nt-Part *wärkṣantāñ*
      m-Part —
      Ger I — Abstr I —
      Inf —
   Sub — Opt —
      Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt II in
   PPt *worku*

Ipv —

For the analysis of the forms I follow Hackstein, 1995, 81ff. We have to do
with a kausativum of a root ᴬ*wärk?*- 'turn (around)' being also attested in the
noun TA *wärkänt* 'wheel'. The PPt TA *worku* in YQ 12 b 1 *(kā)su worku
esnaṃ* as equivalent of Skt. *susaṃvṛttaskandha-* 'having well-rounded
shoulders' is a genuine form (and not a misspelling for TA *woru*; see above
s.v. ᴬ*wär-* '?') and a literal equivalent of Skt. *vṛtta-* 'turned'. Eᴛʏᴍ. To be
derived from PIE *√h₂u̯erg 'sich drehen, sich neigen' (²LIV, 290; Hackstein,
l.c.).

*wärt*ᵃ- 'sich drehen', 'turn' (?) (—)
         Prs VI — Imp —
                  nt-Part —
                  m-Part *wärnāmane*
                  Ger I — Abstr I —
         Sub — Opt —
                  Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                  Inf —
         Pt —
         PPt —
         Ipv —

Hapax in PK AS 17A b 6 (see Pinault, 1984b, 170, 185ff.), a prose passage of a
text lacking MQ characteristics, so that the Prs VI stem belongs to the *nā*-class
(see chap. Prs VI).
= ᴬ*wärt*⁽ᵃ⁾?- 'werfen', 'throw' (tr) (-/-/a)
         Prs — Imp —
                  nt-Part —
                  m-Part —
                  Ger I — Abstr I —
                  Inf —
         Sub — Opt —
                  Ger II — Abstr II —
         Pt II (a) -,-, *worta-ṃ;-,-, wortar*
         PPt —
         Ipv —

On contraction and vowel balance, see chap. Pt II 8.1.3.1.
Eᴛʏᴍ. As per Pinault, 1984b, 185, the grundverb from this root is attested
exclusively in Tocharian B, and the kausativum 'let turn' → 'throw' only in
Tocharian A; but see also the discussion s.v. ᴬ*wär-* '?'. To be derived from PIE
*√u̯ert 'sich umdrehen' (²LIV, 691f.).

ᴬ*wärp-* 'surround' → ᴬ*wārp*⁽ᵃ⁾?- 'id.'

*wärp*ᵃ- 'empfinden; genießen; durchmachen; entgegennehmen; einwilligen',
         'feel; enjoy; suffer; receive; consent' (tr) (m/m/m)
         Prs VI (m) *wärpanamar/wärpnamar*, *wärpnātar* (MQ), *wärpanatär/*

          wärpnātär (sic)/*wärpnatär;* -,-, *wärpanantär/wärpnantär*
          Imp -,-, *wärpänoytär* (MQ);—
          nt-Part —
          m-Part *wärpanamane/wärpnāmane* (sic)
          Ger I *wärpanalle/wärpnalyi* (Š) Abstr I —
    Sub V (m) *warpamar, warpatar, warpatär;*—
          Opt *warpoymar,-, warpoytär;-,-, wärpontär* (MQ)/
           wärpoyentär (S)
          Ger II *warpalle* Abstr II *warpalñe* Priv —
          Inf *warpatsi*
  Pt I (m) *wärpāmai, wärpatai, wärpāte; warpāmte,-, wärpānte*
  PPt *wärpau* (MQ) | *wärpoṣ*
  Ipv I (m) *purwar; pūrpat /purwat*
The 1.sg.mid. Sub *warpamar* is attested in PK AS 15E b 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 2.sg.mid. Sub *warpatar* a couple of times in KVāc (Schmidt, 1986, passim), and a correct 3.sg.mid. Sub form *warpaträ* (beside odd 3.sg.mid. *wärpatar*) in IOL Toch 607 a 1 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.; an MQ variant is found in THT 1305 a 6). The 3.sg.mid. Opt *warpoytra* is found in THT 1543 frg. d a 5 (pace Tamai, 2007a, s.v.), the 3.pl.mid. Opt variant *wärpoyentar* in THT 2171 a 3 (S); the latter is the only form based on the Sub V stem and attested in a standard text that shows non-initial accent. The Ipv *pirpso* analyzed as kausativum form from this root by TochSprR(B), glossary, 170, rather belongs to *yärp-* 'take care' (see s.v.). The Priv *airpätte*, which Schmidt, 1986, 130 analyzed as a form of this root ("unerduldbar"), also rather belongs to *yärp-* 'take care' (see s.v.). The Ipv *purwat* (S) shows the eastern/informal sound change *p* > *w* (see most recently Peyrot, 2008, 88).
= ᴬ***wärp**ᵃ-* 'empfinden; genießen; durchmachen; entgegennehmen;
        einwilligen', 'feel; enjoy; suffer; receive; consent' (tr) (m+/m/m)
    Prs VI (m+) *wärpnāmār,-, wärpnātär; wärpnāmtär,-, wärpnāntär*
        Imp —
        nt-Part *wärpnāntās*
        m-Part *wärpnāmāṃ*
        Ger I *wärpnāl* Abstr I —
        Inf *wärpnātsi*
    Sub V (m) -,-, *wärpātär;-,-, wärpāṃtär*
        Opt -, *wärpitār, wärpitär;-,-, wärpintär*
        Ger II *wärpāl* Abstr II *wärpālune*
  Pt I (m) *wärpe, wärpāte, wärpāt;-,-, wärpānt*
  PPt *wärpo*
  Ipv I (m) *purpar/pūrpar, purpāc/pūrpāc*
The 1.sg. Prs TA *wärpnāmār* is attested in the small fragment THT 1411 frg. d a 1. According to Sieg, Übers. I, 24, fn. 11, and Couvreur, 1956, 79, TA *wārpat* in A 20 a 6 is an Imp from this root: *ptāñkte ñom klyoṣā wārpat ñi pältsäk kāswoneyac* "ich hörte den Namen des Buddha, mein Geist empfand Verlangen nach der Tugend" (Sieg, Übers. I, 24), but a Pt of ᴬ*wārp*ᵃ?- 'urge

oneself' (as per TG, 468) is more likely; see s.v. ^{A}*wārp*$^{ä?}$-. In A 121 b 4 one has to restore a 1.pl. middle form TA *wärpā(mtär/mät)*, but it remains unclear whether subjunctive or preterit is to choose. Damaged TA *w[ärp]n(·)m(·)t* //// in A 155 a 1 should be read and restored to the *m*-Part TA *w[ärp]n(ā)m(ā)n*, as proposed by TG, 470. The restoration of a 1.pl.mid. Imp TA *wärpn(ā)m(ä)t* by Kölver, 1965, 140 (who strangely translates the form as a present "wir genießen") is very unlikely, because one would have expected the fremdzeichen ⟨ma̱⟩, not ⟨ma⟩.

SEM. A neutral sense 'receive' is, e.g., attested in 20 a 5: *ot tāṃ pātrai warpoymar* "dann möchte ich diese Schale entgegennehmen" (TochSprR(B), transl., 32); according to Hackstein, 2003, 181, the basic meaning of the verb is 'embrace', figuratively 'perceive/enjoy', and 'comprehend intellectually'. For the meaning 'consent' (construed with infinitive, e.g., in A 370, 4), see Schmidt, 1986, 122. ETYM. Because of the (almost) constant initial accent found with the TB Sub V stem, I would infer that the root vowel at least in this category derives from a pre-PT *e, which would further require that at least in this category, the root allomorph had been pre-PT *wreP-, and not *werP-. Peters, forthc., indeed proposes a connection with Gk. ῥέπω 'sink, incline towards, happen'.

[*wärs-* 'beflecken' (WTG, 289); as per Schmidt, 1994b, 273f.; 2000, 235, this is a
        ghost root, because the form in question, i.e., *orsa-c* in 243 a 2,
        belongs to *ār*$^{(ä)}$- 'cease'; see s.v.]

wärs$^{ä?}$- '± bemitleiden', '± pity' (tr) (-/-/a)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I (a) -,-, *warsa*;—
        PPt —
        Ipv —
Hapax in 22 a 1. The context points to a meaning '± take pity on'; see TochSprR(B), transl., 22. Since in the Pt I the root-final consonant is unpalatalized, the root had most likely A-character.
~ ^{A}*wras-* 'empfinden, erleiden', 'feel, suffer' (tr) (a/-/-)
        Prs II (a) -,-, *wraṣ*;— Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *wrasy*
        Sub II — Opt —
                Ger II *wraṣäl* Abstr II —

       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

Both roots may belong together (cf. WTG, 289; Adams, DoT, 595). Whether the noun TA *wraske* 'illness' belongs here as well is not so clear.

^A***wärs-*** 'atmen', 'breathe' (itr) (a/-/-)
       Prs VIII (a) -,-, *wärsäṣ;* — Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —
             Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

Undisputed hapax in A 146 b 4: *mā säm tmaṃ wärsäṣ* "(the embryo) is not breathing at that time". The root is also attested in the nouns TA *wraseṃ* 'breath' and TA *wrasom* 'being'.

wärsk- 'smell' → *wär^(a)(-sk)-* 'id.'

wäl²- '± biegen, krümmen', '± bend' (tr) (—)
       Prs — Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
             Inf —
       Pt II in
       PPt *yailuwa*
       Ipv —

The root is also attested in the noun *yel* 'worm'. The PPt *yailuwa* 'bent' in 73 b 1 refers to 'fingers'; see WTG, 290. For semantic reasons, I follow the manuals in separating this root *wäl-* 'bend' from *wäl^a?-* '± shatter'. *wäl-* or *yäl-* '± bend' is arguably to be derived from PIE *√u̯el 'drehen, rollen' (²LIV, 675 without Toch.); see Adams, DoT, 596.

^A***wäl-*** 'sterben', 'die' (itr) (m/m/a)
       Prs X (m) *wälläsmār,-, wälläṣtär/wläṣtär;* —
             Imp *wläṃṣe/wläṃṣāwe,-,-;* —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —

Inf *wlässi* (sic)

Sub III (m) -,-, *wlatär*; *wlamtär*,-,- Opt —

Ger II *wlal* Abstr II *wlalune*

Pt III (a) -,-, *wläs*; *wälmäs*,-,-

PPt *walu*

Ipv —

SEM. Although the root inflects like a causative alternation verb in the present and in the subjunctive, the only attested meaning is 'die', that is, semantically it behaves precisely like an unergative root. ETYM. According to Hackstein, 1995, 301ff. to be derived from a PIE root "*$\underline{u}elh_3$- itr. '(in kriegerischer Auseinandersetzung) besiegt, getötet werden'" also met in Hittite *ḫulla*- "'vernichtend schlagen'" and Greek ἁλῶναι "'(im Kampf) besiegt werden, fallen'" (differently ²LIV, 679: 'schlagen'), and therefore to be separated from *wäl*$^{a?}$-/^{A}*wäl*$^{a?}$- 'shatter' (which according to Hackstein, l.c., comes from a root *√$h_2\underline{u}elh_1$ 'schlagen, rupfen'), the Prs X deriving from a nasal present in pre-PT *-na- which was eventually replaced by PT *-nä-, and the *s*-preterit deriving from an "itr. Akt. Wz.-Aor. **$u\mathring{l}h_3$-t ..., *$u\mathring{l}h_3me$ bzw. medial *$u\mathring{l}h_3$-to, *$u\mathring{l}h_3$-med$^h h_2$" (in which forms the laryngeal had to vanish by sound law); according to Peters, 2006, 339, fn. 25 the latter was "eher ein altes Prät. VI ..., wobei wiederum eine 3.Pl. *$h_{2\beta\mathring{\lambda}}u\mathring{l}h_3$-ent 'sie wurden überwältigt' ... Ausgangspunkt für ein gemeintochar. schwundstufiges themat. Prät. *$wäl$-´ä/æ- 'sterben' gewesen sein wird". As a matter of fact, the present and subjunctive formations from this root may just be modeled on those of one of its antonyms, viz. ^{A}*täm*- 'be born'; as for the Pt III, there exist also some other active Pt III forms in Tocharian A showing both intransitive valency and an -*ä*- as root vowel (which at least in one clear case did not palatalize), and which accordingly should be best derived from former middle forms; as a consequence, TA *wläs* may actually go back to a passively used middle form built from an inherently transitive root, e.g., one with the meaning 'shatter, beat, defeat'; note, however, that both Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian attest to a verbal root *wal- 'die' possibly to be connected with our root (as per Melchert, 1994, 254), and in addition that Lycian has a verbal root *la*- 'die' derived by Melchert, 1994, 290, 308, 316 from a "(virtual) PA *wlaH-" no doubt somehow related to the Luwian root.

wäl$^{a?}$- '± zerschlagen, zerzausen', '± shatter, tousle' (?) (—)

Prs — Imp —

nt-Part —

m-Part —

Ger I — Abstr I —

Sub — Opt —

Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

Inf —

Pt I in

PPt *wlauwa*| *wloṣ*

Ipv —

Instead of a 3.sg.mid. Sub *waltra* from this root (thus WTG, 290), one has to read *kältra* in PK AS 12G a 3 (MQ), according to Couvreur, 1954, 86: //// *tw(e)r[e]ne kaltra* "stands at the door" (confirmed by G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; cf. also the translation of the text by Couvreur, 1953, 282). The PPt *wlauwa* seems in addition attested without context in THT 1158 a 5.

= *Awäl*[ā?]- 'zerschlagen', 'shatter' (?) (−)

       Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt I in
       PPt *wlo*
       Ipv —

SEM. Adams, DoT, 596 translates the root with 'curl' on the evidence of the PPt *wloṣäṃ* in 89 a 2 and the kausativum PPt *yailuwa*. However, the TA equivalent PPt TA *wlo* and the TB form *wlauwa* attested in H 149.14 a 3 show a somewhat different meaning: *wlauwa aścī cets pilentaccī ywārc no ksa ṣememts katsāñ* "their heads battered [and] yet others again among them [were] covered in wounds [and] some with their stomachs ..." (Broomhead I, 143ff.; cf. also Hackstein, 1995, 302 with fn. 43). The meaning 'shatter' for the TA equivalent *wlo* is certain: A 247 b 3 *tmäk yok wlo tñi knānmuneyis pkänt a(tsaṃ)* "eben dadurch [ist] von dir zerspalten worden (jegliche) Hinderung des Verstandes" (see Thomas, 1956, 283). The passage has been identified by Schmidt, 1987, 158 as a translation of VAV 2.38; unfortunately, precisely the pāda in question is lost in the Sanskrit text, but we do have the Tibetan version that runs in German translation: "[Dessen Geist rein ist, dadurch daß alle] Befleckungen and negativen Eindrücke beseitigt sind {...}, dir sei Verehrung!"; see Hartmann, 1987, 112. As for *yailuwa*, it may be better to set up a separate root; see s.v. *wäl*[?]- '± bend'. ETYM. Said to be derived from PIE *√h₂u̯elh₁ 'schlagen, rupfen' by Hackstein, 1995, 302 with fn. 43 (not in ²LIV). The formation of the PPt rather points to a root with A-character, which is in accordance with the fact that the roots *Awäl-* 'die' and *wäl*[?]- '± bend' do not seem to have A-character, so then these roots were not homonyms. From the A-character root *wäl*[ā]- one may then further derive *wlā(-sk)-* '± give off, waft' as a secondary *sk*-extension of the *ān*[(a)]-*sk*- type, but the semantics hardly fit; see s.v.

Awälk[ā?]- '?' (?) (−)

       Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —

Sub — Opt —
   Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt I in
PPt *wälko*
Ipv —

The only morphologically clear and undamaged form from this root is the PPt in A 166 a 3, which, however, remains semantically unclear: //// *kärṣto wälk=oki klopant utkraṃ wärpnātär* //// "as if being cut off and ... he suffers severe sufferings" (cf. Saito, 2006, 87; the form in the fragmentary passage A 440 a 3 compared with this one with question mark by TG, 471 is written *wäl̞k(a)* with virāma in the middle, so it hardly belongs here; it may be true that in TA and TB virāma is sometimes indeed written word-internally, but, to my knowledge, this kind of writing is only found very rarely and is confined to morpheme boundaries, as in the cases of TA *(o)mä[l̞]suneyā* in A 467 b 2 and *yärt̞māṃ* in THT 1483 frg. b b 3). Whether TA *walkä* //// in the small fragment A 170 b 1 is a form from this root and a verbal form at all remains also unclear: //// *(naivā)sikāñ yokmas walkä* //// (restoration according to me) "the ... pertaining to the dwelling places ... the doors". If it belongs here, one may think of a meaning '± burst open" vel sim. Judging by the formation of the PPt, the root had A-character.

wältsʔ- 'zusammenfassen', 'sum up, condense' (?) (—)
  Prs — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
    Inf —
  Pt III in
  PP *aultsu*
  Ipv —

On *aultsu* < *woltsu, see Ringe, 1989a, 36ff.; the PPt also underlies the adverb *aultsorsa* 'briefly, in sum', which is the TB equivalent of TA *waltsurā, woltsurā* 'id.'.

= ᴬ**wältsʔ-** 'zusammenfassen', 'sum up, condense' (?) (—)
  Prs — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
    Inf —
  Sub — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II —
  Pt II in
  PP in *woltsurā*
  Pt III in

PP *waltsu*

Ipv —

A PPt TA †*woltsu* is presupposed by the adverb TA *woltsurā* (attested once) 'briefly, in sum' = TB *aultsorsa*, and similarly TA †*waltsu* by the adverb TA *waltsurā* (attested seven times).

wäs- 'sich kleiden, anziehen', 'don, wear (clothes)' (itr/tr) (m/m/m)

        Prs IXa (m) —;-,-, *yäskeṃtär* Imp -,-, *yäṣṣitär*; —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I *yäṣälle* (MQ) Abstr I —

        Sub I (m) -,-, *wastär*; — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

            Inf *wastsi*/*wassi*

        Pt III (m) -, *wäsātai* (sic), *wässāte*; —

        PPt *ausu* | *ausoṣ*

        Ipv —

The 3.pl.mid. Prs *yäskeṃtär* is attested in KVāc 12 a 1 (Schmidt, 1986, 45; see also Hackstein, 1995, 264f.); the 3.sg.mid. Sub form *wastär* found in PK NS 95 b 1 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.) attests to a Sub I stem; the 2.sg.mid. Pt *wäsātai* is often found in KVāc 12 (this manuscript often shows forms with simplification of double consonants, cf. Schmidt, 1986, V, and 2; the variant *wasātai* is certainly merely due to erroneous omission of the *ä*-dots, even though it is attested a couple of times in the manuscript). The active 3.pl. Pt *wäṣṣāre* attested in H 149.add 5 b 4 can hardly belong to this root (thus, e.g., WTG, 290), because of the palatalized suffix *-ṣṣ-* and because of the fact that there are otherwise only middle forms to be found; see the discussion in Hackstein, 1995, 267f. I set up a separate root *wäsk-* '?' for the form in question; see s.v.

= ^A**wäs-** 'sich kleiden, anziehen', 'don, wear (clothes)' (itr/tr) (-/m/m)

        Prs II — Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I *waṣlaṃ* Abstr I —

            Inf *wassi*

        Sub I/V (m) — Opt *wsīmār*, *wsitār*,-; —

            Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt III (m) *wse*,-,-;-,-, *wsānt*

        PPt *wasu*

        Ipv III (m) *pusār*;-

The Inf TA *wassi* is attested in YQ 25 a 3, on which see also Schmidt, 1999b, 283. Since the noun TA *wsāl* 'garment' is apparently formed to an *ā*-stem from this root, and since the non-palatalized Opt forms TA *wsīmār*, etc. can likewise be analyzed as *ā*-subjunctives (as per Winter 1977, 143 = 1984, 188 = 2005, 180), we certainly have to set up a Sub V for TA. On the other hand, the fem.pl. Ger TA *waṣlaṃ* (pace the manuals; Thomas, 1952, 32; TEB I, 223; § 402

fn. 1) appears to derive from a thematic present and not from a subjunctive stem (cf. TA *akälṣäl* 'pupil' built from Prs VIII), so we have TA †*waṣäl* 'what is to put on' clearly pointing to a Prs II with a root vowel that probably had been pre-PT *ē. The pairing of Sub V with Pt III may be odd, but can easily be explained by a reinterpretation of the middle-only Pt III stem *wäsā- as Pt I stem; the same kind of reanalysis took place precisely in TA in the case of the middle-only Pt III *ænkäsā- from *eṅk-/ᴬemts⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'seize'.

KAUSATIVUM I 'jd. bekleiden', 'dress sb.' (tr) (-/-/m)

       Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt II (m) *wose-ṃ,-,-;*—
       PPt —
       Ipv —

The kausativum is only attested by TA *wose-ṃ* in YQ 41 a 3 (in contrast to Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 277, I do not analyze TA *pusār-ñi* in YQ 26 a 7 as a form of the kausativum).

SEM. The verb can be construed with an object in the obliquus (107 b 4 f. *wässāte kaṣār-wassi* "he put on the *Kāṣāya*-garment"), which is usually a noun made from the same root. The verb is medium tantum (the alleged active form *wäṣṣāre* rather belongs to a separate root *wäsk-* '?'; see below); therefore the voice alternation "Akt. 'jem. bekleiden', Med. 'sich (sibi) anziehen'" reconstructed by WTG, 290 is not backed by any historical evidence, but probably by the root vowel of Prs II which most likely had been a pre-PT *ē. ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√ṷes '(Kleidung) anhaben, bekleidet sein mit' (²LIV, 692f.; Hackstein, 1995, 265ff.; Adams, DoT, 597). Hackstein interprets the irregular palatalization of the root initial in the Prs IXa as a reflex of the PIE root "stative" *ṷes-toi̯ 'hat an', on which the Toch. *sk*-present he says had been based (*ṷes-ske/o-). According to Kümmel (²LIV, 692f.), the athematic subjunctive may directly continue the PIE root "stative", but TB *wäs-* clearly points to origin from a non-Narten root aorist *us-to.

wäs- 'verweilen, wohnen, leben, ruhen', 'dwell, abide, live, lie down'
       (itr) (a+/a/a)
       Prs IXa (a+) -,-, *wsaṣṣäṃ;-,-, wsaskeṃ* Imp —
            nt-Part *wsäṣṣeñca* (MQ)
            m-Part *wsäskemāne* (MQ)
            Ger I *wsaṣṣälle* Abstr I —
       Sub IV (a) *wṣiyau,-, wṣi-ñä* (sic);-,-, *wṣiyeṃ* Opt —
            Ger II *wṣille* Abstr II *wṣīlñe* Priv —
            Inf *wṣītsi*
       Pt VII (a) *wṣeyawa* (S),-, *wṣīya;*—

PPt *auṣu*

Ipv —

See Thomas, 1966a, 171, fn. 2 for the 1.sg. Sub *wṣiyau* (now = THT 1681 b 5; the passage is also cited in Bernhard, 1958, 244, fn. 15) and 3.sg. Sub *wṣi-ñä* (sic). The Ger II *wṣille* is found in PK AS 12H b 5; see Thomas, 1986, 134, and Pinault, 2000a, 151; beside the PPt *auṣuwa* there is also the PPt *auṣusā* in PK AS 12H b 4 (MQ); see Pinault, 2000a, 151. *wäṣṣāre* in H add.149 5 b 4 does rather not belong to this root; see the discussion in Hackstein, 1995, 268 and s.v. *wäsk-* '?'.

SEM. For the semantics, see Hackstein, 1995, 218f. ETYM. To be derived from PIE *$\sqrt{h_2ues}$ '(ver)weilen, die Nacht verbringen' (^{2}LIV, 293f.; in detail Hackstein, 1995, 219ff.; Adams, DoT, 597f.). Klingenschmitt, 1994, 407 = 2005, 432, fn. 165 assumes that the subjunctive continues a PIE present *h_2us-ih_2-ie/o-, the imperfect of which PIE *h_2usih_2-iet is continued in the preterit by simply adding the -$ā$-suffix. Adams, 1988a, 73 sets up a simple *ie/o*-present "*us-ie/o-", but Kim, 2007a, 52 assumes a "morphological replacement" of some kind, because "*h_2us-$ié/ó$- should have become PT *$wäṣä/æ$-".

wä(s)$^?$- 'geben', 'give' (tr) (-/-/a)

Prs — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
    Inf —
Pt I + III (a) *wsāwa, wsāsta, wasa/wsā-ne/wsa; wasam/*
    wsam,-, wsar-ne/wsar/wsare/wsär-ñi/wäsare/wsāre
PPt —
Ipv —

The stem provides the suppletive preterit stem for the active forms of *ai-* 'give' (note that its middle means 'take'). The singular forms are clearly forms of Pt I, whereas in the plural we have a mix of forms from both Pt I and Pt III. The 1.sg. *wsāwa* is found in letters of the Paris collection and in the Berlin letter 470 a 2, and it is also attested in the literary texts 22 a 8 (Š) and H add.149 88 b 4 (provenance unknown); the 2.sg. *wsāsta* is found in the literary MQ text 221 a 4 and in the graffito Qu 34 (see Pinault, 1994a, 175), and the restoration of a 2.sg. *wsā(sta)* in 239 b 3 is now assured by the parallel text THT 3597 (= Mainz 655, 1) b 6 (cf. Schmidt, 1983a, 273f.). The 3.sg. *wasa/wsā-* is attested fairly often, including literary texts from Šorčuq and MQ, the informal-style variant *wsa* in PK Cp 11, 5 (Peyrot, 2008, 155). The 1.pl. *wsam* is, e.g., attested in the Paris monastery record PK Cp 26, 1 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), and the 1.pl. variant *wasam* in the Berlin monastery record 490 Kol. I b 2. According to Winter, 1997, 187 = 1998, 351 = 2005, 495, *wasam* simply stands for *wäsām*, claiming we are dealing with "a manuscript in which schwa dots are not used with *wa-*"; note that omission of the *ä*-dots on

wä is also attested otherwise in documents of profane nature or, e.g., in the KVāc manuscript (see s.v. *wäs-* 'don'). Beside the 3.pl. Pt I *wsāre* there are various 3.pl. Pt III forms attested: *wsar-ne* 'they gave him' in PK NS 36A b 4 (Couvreur, 1964, 247), the MQ form *wsär-ñi* 'they gave me' in BM b 4, and *wsar*͵ in the administrative documents THT 4059 a 1 and THT 4062 a 1 (Schmidt, 2001d, 20ff.); in addition, there are the 3.pl. Pt forms *wsare* and *wäsare* found in business documents. The monastery records edited by Pinault, 1998 show the 3.sg. Pt *wasa* and 3.pl. Pt *wsare*.

= ᴬ*wä(s)ʔ-* 'geben', 'give' (tr) (-/-/a)

      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt I (a) *wsā, wsāṣt, wäs*;—
      Pt III (a) —;-,-, *wäsr-äṃ*
      PPt *wawu*
      Ipv —

The root provides the suppletive preterit and PPt for ᴬ*e-* 'give'. The existence of a 2.sg. TA *wsāṣt* in A 132 a 5 "bleibt zweifelhaft" (TG, 424, fn. 2; TochSprR(A) separates //// [p(·)ā]neyā wsā ṣtām). In favor of a 2.sg. preterit one could refer to the 2.sg. Pt in line a 4 TA *tākaṣt* 'you were'; therefore I would like to propose degemination in a phrase TA *wsāṣt <t>ām* "you gave this". The 1.sg. TA *wsā* is now also a couple of times attested in the YQ manuscript. ETYM. Schmidt, 1986a, 648 argues the 3.pl. forms *wsare, wäsare*, and *wsāre* are informal-style forms, because of their being attested in documents of profane nature, and that *wsär-ñi*, found in BM (which is a manuscript in archaic ductus; see Malzahn, 2007a, 269ff.), is a formal-style variant, so that one should conclude that the Pt III is the original class. On the other hand, Winter, 1965a, 208 = 1984, 174f. = 2005, 133, fn. 1 sets up PT *wäsā- as the original stem by claiming that "die vom Normalparadigma abweichenden Formen der dritten Person Plural nur mit suffigiertem Pronomen belegt sind" and that the zero-grade root ablaut speaks against an old *s*-preterit. According to WTG, 185f., the TA PPt suggests a former *s*-less root *u̯e-* that formed an *s*-preterit that was later reanalyzed as a Pt I. In contrast, Winter, 1997, 187f. = 1998, 351f. = 2005, 495f. believes that the original root shape was rather *wäs-. The reason for Winter to start with *wäs- is his idea of connecting the verbal root with TB *wase* 'poison', which he claims goes back to old *u̯is-o-. Tocharian would, if Winter's assumption is correct, however, be the only language to preserve the verbal root *√u̯is meaning 'give', on which the PIE noun for 'poison' he claims was based. Differently, Adams, DoT, 101 derives the root from a *se/o*-present formed with the preverb *u̯i-, which is not too likely a scenario for morphological reasons. This could be bettered by assuming that *u̯i, or *bʰi, or rather a *u̯i-deh₃ or *bʰi-

deh₃-, was turned into/formed an *s*-preterit. On stems of similar structure with the root *√dʰeh₁ 'set' continued in Tocharian, see Hackstein, 2002, 7ff. In addition, Hackstein, 2001, 17ff. has reasonably argued that the irregular imperative to the TB verb for 'give', i.e., the 2.sg. *pete*, etc. is to be derived from PIE *√deh₃ as well. Hackstein, 2001, 30f. further shows that the similarly opaque TA imperatives of the verb for 'give', i.e., the 2.sg. TA *paṣ* and 2.pl. TA *pac* may go back to *√deh₃ as well, though in the end he prefers to derive them from a root PIE *√h₃u̯is, and then proposes to derive *wä(s)ʔ-* 'give' from that root as well (²LIV, 297 sets up this root as *√h₃ei̯t 'mitnehmen').

wäsk- 'move' → *wāsk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'id.'

wäsk- '?' (?) (-/-/a)
       Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
       Pt I (a) —;-,-, *wäṣṣāre*
       PPt —
       Ipv —
Hapax without much context in H 149.add 5 b 4: //// *ne [w]äṣṣāre • tumeṃ Śuddhoda(ne)* //// "they ... (in ?). Thereupon Śuddhodana ...". The manuals mostly take the form as Pt from *wäs-* 'put on (clothes)', but as Hackstein, 1995, 267f. points out correctly, this is highly improbable for morphological reasons, and so would be assignment to *wäs-* 'dwell'. We may be dealing with a root *wäsk-* forming a palatalized *ā*-preterit, which would imply a thematic subjunctive and present stem.

wi- 'erschrecken', 'frighten' (tr) (a/m/-)
       Prs IXb (a) —;-,-, *wīyäskeṃ* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub I/II (m) -,-, *wiyatär-ne*; — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II *wiyälyñe* (sic) Priv —
            Inf —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —
WTG does not list this root, and TEB II, 241 lists it with the present form only and translate it with 'erschrecken, scheuchen (?)'. The 3.pl. Prs *wiyäskeṃ* is attested in PK NS 30 a 2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.): //// *rna ywārcä walkwi ramṯa wīyäskeṃ m(ñ)[cu](ṣkeṃ)* //// "amid ... they

frighten the prince like wolves"; on *walkwe* from PIE *$u̯ĺk^u̯os$ 'wolf', see Fellner, 2005, 141f. The 3.sg.mid. Sub *wiyatär-ne* is attested in PK NS 45 b 2 and the Abstr *wiyälyñe* in PK AS 15D b 4 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). Note that *wĭyä-*, *wiya-* instead of expected **wĭC-* must be back-formations to 3.pl. Sub I/II †*wiyentär* and similar forms with *wiye-*.

= ᴬ**wi⁽ᵃ⁾-** 'sich fürchten', 'be frightened' (itr) (-/-/a)

<div style="padding-left:2em">

Prs — Imp —

    nt-Part —

    m-Part —

    Ger I — Abstr I —

    Inf —

Sub — Opt —

    Ger II — Abstr II —

Pt I in

PPt *wiyo*

Pt III (a) *wīyu*,-,-;—

Ipv —

</div>

Schmidt/Winter, 1992, 54 = Winter, 2005, 438 analyze TA *wīyu* in A 295 a 4 as a 1.sg.act. of an intransitive *s*-preterit from this root: TA *wīyu trīkū cam klopyo* "ich war verstört [und] verwirrt durch dieses Leid". For similar highly irregular Pt III forms, see also chap.s Valency 4.5.1.1. and Pt III 9.1.2.1.

ETYM. PIE *√*du̯ei̯* 'in Furcht geraten, erschrecken' (²LIV, 130).

wik⁽ᵃ⁾- 'schwinden', 'disappear' (itr) (m/m/a)

<div style="padding-left:2em">

Prs III (m) -,-, *wiketär*;-,-, *wikentar-ne* (sic) Imp —

    nt-Part —

    m-Part —

    Ger I — Abstr I —

Sub V (m) -,-, *wikātär-me*; —

    Opt -,-, *wikoytär*;-,-, *wikoyntär/wikoyentär*

    Ger II *wikalle* (MQ) Abstr II *wikālñe* Priv —

    Inf *wikātsi*

Pt I (a) -,-, *wīka*; —

PPt *wikoṣäṃ*

Ipv I (a) -; *pwīkaso*

</div>

The 3.sg.mid. Sub *wikātär-me* is attested in PK AS 17D a 5 (see Couvreur, 1954, 87, followed by Carling, 2003b, 66: *traike wrotstse amarṣe wikātär-m(e) snai lyīpär* "die große Verwirrung des Unwillens wird euch restlos schwinden"). TochSprR(B) proposed to restore a 2.sg.act. Opt *(wiko)yt* in 406 b 4, but this remains uncertain. The 3.pl.mid. Opt variant *wikoye[n](ta)r*͔ seems attested in THT 2171 a 4. For the transitive Ipv *pwīkaso* 'remove!' (formally Ipv I), see below.

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'vermeiden, sich fernhalten von', 'avoid' (tr) (a/a/-)

      Prs VIII (a) —;-,-, *wiksen-ne* Imp —
           nt-Part *wikṣeñca*
           m-Part —
           Ger I *wikṣalle* Abstr I —
      Sub II (a) — Opt *wīśim*,-, *wīśi*;—
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf *wiśsi/wistsi* (MQ)
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv III (a) -; *pwikso*

The 1.sg. Prs *wiksau* is only listed in TEB I, 175, § 299,2 without ref., the 3.sg. *wikṣäṃ* only in TEB I, 175, § 299,1c; both forms are maybe merely reconstructed. The alleged 3.sg. Sub *wiśä(ṃ)* said to be attested in H 149.165 (= U 26) b 3 [recte b 4] by WTG, 291 is based on an incorrect word separation by Lévi, 1933, 56; see Thomas, 1969a, 299, fn. 47; 1971, 42. Instead of an Abstr *[wik]ṣälñe* (thus TEB II, 68, no. XXV, 9) one has to read *rassalñe* in K 3 (= PK AS 7C) b 2, as per Pinault, 2007, 210. Hackstein, 1995, 136 has correctly analyzed the Ipv 2.pl. *pwikso* as *s*-imperative (contra the manuals), but I see no compelling reason to interpret the two attested forms (13 a 1, 33 a 1) as intransitives. For the *ā*-stem Priv *aikaccepi*, see Hilmarsson, 1991, 55f. and chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.2.

KAUSATIVUM II 'vertreiben, entfernen', 'drive away, remove' (tr) (a/a/a)

      Prs IXb (a) *wīkäskau*,-, *wikäṣṣäṃ*;-,-, *wīkäskeṃ* Imp —
           nt-Part *wīkäṣṣeñca*
           m-Part —
           Ger I *wikäṣṣälle* Abstr I —
      Sub IXb (a) — Opt *wīkäṣṣim*,-, *wikäṣṣi*;—
           Ger II — Abstr II *wikäṣälñe/wikṣälñe* Priv —
           Inf *wīkässi/wikastsi* (MQ)
      Pt II (a) -, *yaikasta, yaika*;-,-, *yaikare*
      PPt *yaiku| yaikoṣ*
      Ipv II (x) *pika*;-|-; *pikāt* (MQ)

A 3.sg. Prs/Sub *lau … wikäṣṣäṃ* is also attested in THT 1126 a 4. The 3.pl. Pt *yaikare* is found in PK AS 6D a 3f. (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.) and PK AS 16.3 a 1 (Pinault, 1989a, 156).

= A*wik(ä)*- 'schwinden', 'disappear' (itr) (m/a/a)

      Prs III (m) —;-,-, *wikantär* Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part —
           Ger I — Abstr I —
           Inf —
      Sub V (a) -,-, *wekaṣ*;— Opt —
           Ger II — Abstr II *wikālune*
      Pt I (a) -,-, *wikā-m*;—
      PPt *wiko*

Ipv —
ANTIGRUNDVERB 'vermeiden, sich fernhalten von', 'avoid' (tr) (a/-/-)
  Prs VIII (a) -, *wikäṣt*, *wikäṣ*; — Imp —
      nt-Part —
      m-Part —
      Ger I *wikäṣläṃ* Abstr I —
      Inf —
  Sub — Opt
      Ger II — Abstr II —
  Pt III in
  PPt *wawiku*
  Ipv —
KAUSATIVUM II 'vertreiben, entfernen', 'drive out, remove' (tr) (a+/a/a)
  Prs VIII (a+) -,-, *wikäṣ*;-,-, *wikseñc* Imp -,-, *wikṣā*; —
      nt-Part *wikṣant*
      m-Part *wikäsmāṃ*
      Ger I — Abstr I —
      Inf *wikässi*
  Sub IX (a) *wikāsam*,-, *wikāṣ*; — Opt —
      Ger II *wikāṣäl* Abstr II *wikāṣlune*
  Pt II (a) -,-, *wawik*;-,-, *wawikār*
  PPt *wawiku*
  Ipv II (a) *pwikā-m*; —

The Prs VIII is the present stem of both the antigrundverb (< *s*-present) and the kausativum (< *sk*-present). We are dealing with the antigrundverb in A 246 b 4: *(u)mpar-ytār wikäṣt* "du vermeidest den schlechten Weg" (Hackstein, 1995, 134 with fn. 93), A 227/8 b 7: *wikseñc māntlune* "they avoid (the evil) disposition" (cf. Pinault, 1999, 231), and arguably also in YQ 9 b 4: *(kärsnā)läṃ wram puk kärso wikäṣläṃ wram wawiku knānmāṃ pāpṣu* "having learned everything that can be learned, having avoided everything that can be avoided, wise and disciplined" (cf. Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 61, who, however, translate 'removed'). The Inf TA *wikässi* in YQ 1 a 6 rather belongs to the kausativum: *wraske mokone wlalune wikässi* "in order to remove sickness, old age, and death" (Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 65). The 3.pl. Pt TA *wawikār-ä(m)* (TG, 472 "Frgm.") can be found in THT 1542 frg. e a 3.

SEM. Hackstein, 1995, 133ff. with fn. 90 argues that there are transitive forms made from the grundverb having the same meaning as the kausativum, which would be very remarkable, and could, as Hackstein points out correctly, only be secondary. However, I am not convinced by the examples. The alleged 3.sg.mid. Prs *wiketrä* in H 149.46 b 5 as restored by Broomhead I, 54 (*k ͗ᵤse eṅkäl wike(trä)* //// "he who drives away passion") can be restored to *wike(māne)* "disappearing passion"; *wikātsi* in 127 b 6 (MQ) (*waimene sklok wikātsi* "[es ist] schwierig, Zweifel zu vertreiben") is, in fact, a non-finite form, and may be interpreted as "[it is] difficult [for] doubt to disappear" (thus Adams, DoT, 599); the same is basically true for the non-finite forms Ger *wikalle* in 295 b 8 and for restored *w(i)k(or)m(eṃ)* in 203 b 1; TA *wika(trä)* in

A 391 a 6 is also a restored form attested in sentence and pāda-final position without much context. TochSprR(A) edits //// *s puk wika(–)* •. Although we have here a translation of Uv. 12.17 c-d, i.e., a translation of Skt. *prahāsyate* 'will remove' (cf. Bernhard, 1965, 198), this does not mean that the Tocharian translator used a transitive TA *wika(trä)*. As for the 2.pl. Ipv *pwīkaso* in K 1 b [recte a] 5 *(ekñiñ)[ñ](e)[n]t(a) pw[ī]kaso* "lasset den Besitz fahren" (see Sieg, 1938, 4, not discussed by Hackstein, l.c.), this would not prove transitive valency for the grundverb either, because the imperative of basically intransitive stems can (very rarely) be used transitively; see chap. Valency 4.10.1. ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√u̯eig̑ 'in Bewegung geraten, sich entfernen' (²LIV, 667f.; Hackstein, 1995, 134ff.) or maybe from PIE *√u̯ei̯k̑ 'eingehen, eintreten' (²LIV, 669f.); see Adams, DoT, 600; cf. also chap. Sub II 19.1.5.

Awin- '?' (?) (a/-/-)
        Prs II (a) —;-,-, *wineñc* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
Unclear hapax in YQ 4 b 8: //// *āpat swāñcenāñ wineñc-äṃ* "rays appear (?) on his right side" (Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 75).

winᵃ-ññ- 'Gefallen finden', 'enjoy, find pleasure in' (itr) (m/-/-)
        Prs XII (m) -,-, *wināntär*;-,-, *wināññentär* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub XII — Opt —
                Ger II *winālye* Abstr II *winālñe/wināññe* Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
The restoration of contextless *wina[n](·)[ā]r* in 361 a 9 (M) to a 2.sg.mid. Prs from this root (thus WTG, 291 with question mark) is very uncertain; the 3.sg.mid. *wināntä* is attested in IOL Toch 801 b 3 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.).
= *Awin-iññ-* 'Gefallen finden', 'enjoy, find pleasure in' (itr) (m/m/-)
        Prs XII (m) -,-, *witär* (sic);— Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —

Ger I — Abstr I —
Inf —
Sub XII (m) -, *wiñtār*,-;— Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The manuals do not list a TA equivalent of the TB root, but Hilmarsson, 1991a, 86f. adduced the 2.sg.mid. Sub TA *wiñtār* in A 70 b 6, whose meaning is assured by the Sanskrit parallel version: "wirst du dich wie zwischen … befindlich bestimmt erfreuen" (see Sieg, Übers. II, 44, with fn. 11; Thomas, 1989, 21). Furthermore, Hilmarsson followed the interpretation of A 222 a 7 by TG, 380 by which an Imp TA *wiññāt* is gained: *k ͡ul(e)yaṃ pältsäk cacräṅku mrosäṅkātsi mā n<u> wiññāt* "having attached [his] thought [on]to the woman, he did not take pleasure [in] renouncing". Although this is perfectly possible, unlike Hilmarsson I would not exclude that Couvreur's reading of the passage resulting in a TA Imp *nwiññāt* from a root *ᴬnwā-* is correct; see the discussion s.v. *ᴬnwᵃ-* '± bear, suffer'. In addition, one can restore the word fragment TA *witä(–)* in A 462 a 5 to TA *witä(r)* and analyze it as a 3.sg.mid. Prs from this root (cf. TG, 471, where TA *witä(–)* and TA *wiñtār* are treated as cognates). The form translates preceding Skt. *rocate*, which has to be translated by 'enjoys' and not 'shines', because of its being coordinated with *kṣamate* 'is appropriate' (see Sieg, 1943, 137; Couvreur, 1956, 70 contra Poucha, TLT, 301 s.v. ²*wi-*; Skt. *rocate* and *kṣamate* are often found together, cf. SWTF s.v. *kṣam*). For TA *wineñc-aṃ* in YQ 4 b 8 I follow Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 277 in setting up a special root *ᴬwin-* '?'; see s.v.

ETYM. Said to be a denominative based on an *n*-stem **wīnān-* 'joy' (allegedly continued in TB *wīna*) by Hilmarsson, 1991a, 85ff., but the analysis of *wīna* as an *n*-stem is clearly wrong; see below s.v. *winᵃ-sk-* 'venerate'.

winᵃ-sk- act. 'verehren', mid. 'bekennen, beichten', act. 'venerate, honor', mid. 'confess' (tr) (x/a/a)
Prs IXa (x) *wināskau, wināst, wināṣṣāṃ; wināskem*,-,-;-,-, *wināskeṃ|*
winaskemar (MQ),-,-;— Imp —;-,-, *wināṣyen-ne*
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I *wināṣṣälle* Abstr I —
Sub IXa (a) — Opt -,-, *wināṣṣi*;—
Ger II — Abstr II *wināṣṣälñe* Priv —
Inf *wīnāssī*
Pt IV (a) -, *wināṣṣasta, wināṣṣa-me*;-,-, *wināṣṣare/wināṣṣar-ne* (S)
PPt *wewīnäṣṣu| wewīnaṣṣoṣ/* in *wewīnäṣṣormeṃ*
Ipv —

The 2.sg. Pt *wināṣṣasta* is attested in KVāc 24 b 3 (Schmidt, 1986, 57), and a 3.pl. Pt variant *wināṣṣare* with clearly readable *-are* (beside the restored form

in 108 b 1) can be found in the small fragment THT 2370 frg. k a 1. The nom.sg. PPt *wewīnäṣṣ(u)* with replacement of *-ā-* by *-ä-* is attested in IOL Toch 274 a 6 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v. contra Broomhead I, 365), and beside the PPt *wewīnaṣṣoṣ* with preservation of the (*)-*ā-* in 74 b 1, there is also an Abs *wewīnäṣṣormeṃ* to be found in PK AS 17K b 2 (cited by Lévi/Meillet, 1913, 385 under a different signature).

= ᴬ*win*ᵃ*-s-* 'verehren', 'honor, venerate' (tr) (a+/-/a)

       Prs VIII (a+) *wināsam,-,-; wināsamäs,-, wināsenc*
              Imp -,-, *wināṣā-ṃ;-,-, wināṣār*
              nt-Part —
              m-Part *wināsmāṃ*
              Ger I *wināṣäl* Abstr I —
              Inf *wināssi*
       Sub IX — Opt —
              Ger II — Abstr II *wināṣlune*
       Pt IV (a) -,-, *wināṣā;*—
       PPt in *wawiṃṣuräṣ*
       Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. The middle (only attested in TB) has the meaning 'confess'; see Schmidt, 1974, 415. Eᴛʏᴍ. Melchert, 1978, 127 and Schmidt, 1982, 367 derive the root from a primary PIE present stem formation *u̯n̥H-sk̂e/o- from PIE *√u̯enH (²LIV, 682f. 'liebgewinnen', without Toch.), but phonologically only a (somewhat irregular) full-grade variant *u̯enH-sk̂e/o- would do the trick. Since Tocharian B has a noun *wīna* 'joy', one would like very much to side with Hackstein, 1995, 101, who took the verb for a denominative from that noun, and (implicitly) also wanted to explain the irregular preservation of the -*ā*- in front of the TA Prs VIII morpheme -*s*- by the status of the verb as denominative. If this analysis is correct, no doubt the Prs XII verb *win*ᵃ*-ññ-/* ᴬ*win-iññ-* 'enjoy' is also best explained as a denominative (see for such an analysis Hilmarsson, 1991a, 85ff. with ref. and also Adams, DoT, 602). There is just one problem with such a kind of analysis: Tocharian A does not have a noun †*wiṃ* for 'joy', and responds to TB *wīna* with a noun derived from the same root, but with a completely different kind of stem formation, viz. TA *wañi*. Adams, DoT, 603 rather recommends to separate this verb from *wīna* (and *√u̯enH) completely.

wip- 'schütteln, schlenkern', 'shake, dangle' (tr) (a+/-/-)

       Prs IX (a+) -,-, *wīpäṣṣäṃ* (MQ);— Imp —
              nt-Part —
              m-Part *wipäskemane* (MQ)
              Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub — Opt —
              Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
              Inf —
       Pt —
       PPt —

Ipv —

SEM. The *m*-Part *wipäskemane* refers to body parts (head, arms); this is arguably also true for the 3.sg. Prs *wīpä(ṣṣäṃ)* in 597 a 5 (to be restored with some certainty), since this form seems to refer either to a form *maś* 'fist' (thus Adams, DoT, 603) or *m=(ā)ś* 'head' (thus TochSprR(B) with fn. 14); in both cases a final *-c* must have been dropped, which is a phenomenon indeed found otherwise. There are only MQ forms attested, so the accent and hence the present class is unclear (note that the manuscript 597 hails from the Kuča region and not from Murtuq; see Adaktylos et al., 2007, 41f.). ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√u̯ei̯p 'in schwingende/zitternde Bewegung geraten' (²LIV, 671 without Toch.); see Adams, DoT, 603.

ᴬwip- 'be wet' → *waiw⁽ᵃ⁾-/ᴬwip⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'id.'

ᴬwe- act. 'sprießen lassen', 'let sprout', mid. 'sprießen', 'sprout'
   (tr/itr) (x/-/-)
   Prs VI (x) -,-, *wenaṣ;—* | -,-, *wenatär;-,-, wenantär* Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —

A transitive active TA *wena<ṣ>* is to be restored in A 145 a 4, as per TG, 473. The 3.pl.mid. in A 156 a 2 is intransitive (cf. Schmidt, 1974, 132), the 3.sg.mid. TA *wenatä* (TG, 472 "frg.") is attested in THT 1142 b 1 (without context). ETYM. Since in Tocharian A root-final *-t-* could disappear before the nasal suffix, we may be dealing with a root *ᴬwetᵃ-* (Prs VI roots always have A-character). On the other hand, maybe this is rather a denominative to a *-neh₂-derivative, but further cognates are unclear.

ᴬwekᵃ- 'auseinanderfallen, zerbrechen', 'fall apart, break' (itr) (-/m/m)
   Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub V (m) —;-,-, *wekantär* Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt I (m) -,-, *wekat;—*
   PPt *wāweku*
   Ipv —

SEM. According to TG, 473, there is a homonymic root ^{A}*wek-2* 'tell lies' attested in the PPt TA *wāweku* in A 272 b 3 and A 371 a 5, for which see s.v. ^{A}*wek?-* 'lie'. A clear instance of a PPt TA *wāweku* 'fallen apart' made from this root is attested in A 13 a 2 (referring to 'bones'). ETYM. See below s.v. ^{A}*wek?-* 'lie'.

^{A}**wek?-** 'lügen', 'lie, tell lies' (tr) (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I/III in
        PPt *wāweku*
        Ipv —

According to TG, 473, one has to set up to different roots ^{A}*wek-* 'fall apart' and ^{A}*wek-2* 'tell lies'. The latter is said to be attested by the PPt TA *wāweku* found in A 272 b 3 and A 371 a 5: A 272 b 3 //// *wā(we)ku mā smale skam s$_u$ʔkatikāñ*; A 371 a 5 //// *smale viṣām tsär wāweku wewñu tām* "if I speak an evil, hard ... lie". In both passages the PPt is found beside TA *smale* 'lie, falsehood' being the equivalent of Skt. *mṛṣāvāda-* 'lie, falsehood', one of the *akuśala karmapatha* ("karmically unwholesome deeds", "heilswidrige Handlungsweisen"; see basically Weber, 1999, 13ff., and Pinault, 1999, 229). It is unclear to me whether TA *wāweku* in these two passages still functions as a PPt or is rather a lexicalized term denoting some kind of sinful verbal communication such as the no doubt related TB term *waike* 'lie'. Saito, 2006, 377 opted for the first kind of analysis, rendering A 371 a 5 by "Wenn ich eine boshafte, harte, in Widerspruch geratene [wtl. auseinandergefallene] Lüge ausgesprochen habe ..." (and thereby referring the PPt to a root denoting 'auseinanderfallen' still synchronically), and Couvreur, 1959, 252 for the second kind of approach, taking TA *wāweku* in the same passage evidently as a TA term for the sixth *akuśala karmapatha*, which is named in Sanskrit *saṃbhinnapralāpa* and has to be rendered by 'chitchat, babble, nonsense'. If TA *wāweku* was indeed such a term, it could still have started out as a PPt from a root denoting 'break', cf. Modern English *break the news* and TB *käskor* 'chitchat' derived from the root *käsk^a-* 'scatter' — actually Pinault, 1999, 230 has shown that in A 227/8 b 7 precisely TA *käs(k)o* (no doubt from a TA cognate of the TB root *käsk^a-* 'scatter') functions as a TA equivalent of Skt. *saṃbhinnapralāpa-*. ETYM. As argued immediately above, this TA PPt (and as a consequence also TB *waike* 'lie') may perfectly well derive from a root with the original meaning 'break (tr/itr)'; actually the forms from ^{A}*wek^a-* 'fall apart, break' may belong to a denominative from a pre-PT **u̯oi̯ko-* derived from the root *√u̯ei̯k* said to have denoted 'aussieben' by ^{2}LIV, 670. Adams, DoT, 612 also assumed a denominative origin for what he thinks was a TA verb "*wek-* 'to lie'", and further accepted Schneider's (1939, 253) connection with a

Germanic root denoting 'deceive, betray' (from *√su̯ei̯gu̯ 'ausweichen; im Stich lassen' according to ²LIV, 608; there is no mention of the Tocharian root).

we-ñ- act. 'sagen, sprechen', 'say, speak', mid. 'genannt werden',
          'be called' (tr) (x/a/x)
          Prs IXa (x) *weskau, west, weṣṣäṃ; weskem, weścer, weskeṃ;*
                    -,-, westeṃ| weskemar, westär (sic), *westär;-,-, weskentär*
                     Imp *weṣṣim, weṣṣit, weṣṣi;-,-, weṣyeṃ*
                    nt-Part *weṣṣeñca*
                    m-Part *weskemane*
                    Ger I *weṣṣälle* (Š) Abstr I —
          Sub (a) *weñau, went, weṃ; weñem, weñcer, weñeṃ*
                    Opt *weñim,-, weñi; —*
                     Ger II *welle* Abstr II *welñe* Priv —
                     Inf *wentsi*
          Pt V (x) *weñāwa/wñāwa, weñāsta/wñasta* (MQ), *weña/wñā-ne;*
                    weñām, wñās, weñāre/wñāre/weñāre-neś (S)/*weñār-mes*
                    (S)/*weñār* (S)/*wñār-ne* (S) | —;-,-, *weñānte*
          PPt *weweñu| weweñoṣ*
          Ipv V (a) *poñ; pontso* (Š)/ *poñes* (S)
The 2.sg.mid. Prs *westrä* translates Skt. *gī<r>yase* in H add.149 80 a 3 (cf. Couvreur, 1966, 180; Broomhead I, 361); the present stem shows clear instances of initial accent, cf. Hackstein, 1995, 208f., which, however, may all just be due to the *pātär* rule (cf. chap. Sound Laws 1.3.). The 2.sg. Imp *weṣṣit* is attested in PK AS 7A b 6 (= unpublished part of K 1, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 2.sg. Sub *w(e)nt-meścä* in St. 42.2.1 a 3 (= IOL Toch 285, MQ character), cf. Broomhead I, 312 and Peyrot, 2007, s.v. A passive 3.pl.mid. Pt *(weñ)[ā]nte* is restored by Pinault, 1989a, 157 and 184f. in PK AS 16.3 b 1. The preterit forms often show irregular syncope of the root vowel *e*, and do so even in archaic texts such as 274 (see the survey in Peyrot, 2008, 148), evidently as a result of irregular weakening (viz. of PT *æ to *ä) in forms of high frequency (as also encountered in TA *we*; see below), as per Winter, 1977, 155f. = 1984, 201 = 2005, 192f.; cf. Peters, 2004, 438, fn. 40.
= *Awe-ñ-* 'sagen, sprechen', 'say, speak' (tr) (-/a/a)
          Prs — Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
                    Inf —
          Sub VII (a) *weñam,-, weñäṣ;-,-, weñeñc* Opt -,-, *weñiṣ; —*
                     Ger II *weñläṃ* Abstr II *weñlune*
          Pt V (a) *weñā, weñāṣt, we/weñā-ṃ; weñāmäs, weñās, weñār*
          PPt *wewñu*
          Ipv V (a) *peṃ; penäs*
Atränk- 'say, speak' provides the suppletive present stem. For the 3.sg. Pt TA *we* (instead of expected †*weṃ*), see Winter, 1977, 155f. = 1984, 201 = 2005, 192f.

with ref., who assumes irregular reduction not unusual in forms of high frequency (NB: comparable to the syncope of the root vowel in the TB preterit; see above); similarly Peters, 2006, 340, fn. 26.

KAUSATIVUM IV 'sagen lassen', 'make say' (tr) (—)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *wenäṣlis* Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

SEM. The middle is always passive and has the meaning 'be called' (see Schmidt, 1974, 207; 224f.). ETYM. Usually derived from PIE *√u̯ekʷ 'sagen' (²LIV, 673f., without Toch.); see the discussion in Adams, DoT, 606f.: according to Lane, 1953a, 287, followed by Winter, 1977, 133ff. = 1984, 178ff. = 2005, 170ff. and Hilmarsson, 1991a, 113f., the stem *weñ-* continues PIE *u̯okʷ-n-i̯e/o- > *wæk-ñ(ñ)-, but this analysis actually runs counter to the established rules of PIE syllabification, and a proto-form *u̯okʷn̥-i̯e/-, which would be consistent with those rules, could not have led to PT *wæñ̃- (see for this reconstruction Hilmarsson, 1991a, 106); therefore, *we-ñ-* is to be derived from *√h₂u̯ed(H) 'utter' (cf. ²LIV, 286), as per Pinault, 1994, 135 and Peters, 2006, 344f., fn. 47, 48. The verb is discussed in more detail in chap. Sub VII 22.2.3.1.

waiw⁽ä⁾- 'feucht sein/werden', 'be/become wet' (?) (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *waiwalñe* Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The hapax *waiwalñe* in Fill. Y 3 a 2 is the equivalent of Skt. *saṃkleda-* 'humidité par putréfaction'; see most recently Carling, 2003a, 55. Judging by the A-character of the respective TA root, we are most likely dealing with a form from a Sub V with persistent initial accent and not one from a Sub I (thus WTG, 121, § 120, fn. 3).

KAUSATIVUM I 'feucht machen, benetzen', 'moisten' (tr) (a/-/-)

        Prs IXb (a) -,-, *waiwäṣṣäṃ-ne*; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —

                    Ger I — Abstr I —
          Sub — Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                    Inf —
          Pt —
          PPt —
          Ipv —
~ ^A***wip^(ä)-*** '(sich) benetzen, anfeuchten', 'moisten' (?) (—)
          Prs V — Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
                    Inf *wipāsi*
          Sub — Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II —
          Pt I in
          PPt *wipo*
          Ipv —
KAUSATIVUM I 'feucht machen', 'make wet' (tr) (a/-/-)
          Prs VIII (a) -,-, *wipäṣṣ-äṃ;* — Imp —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
                    Inf —
          Sub — Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II —
          Pt —
          PPt —
          Ipv —

Since TB has an oppositional transitive present stem of Class IXb, it is likely that the TA Prs also goes back to an *sk*-stem, i.e., belongs to a kausativum and not an antigrundverb paradigm.

SEM. The once attested Inf TA *wipāsi* in A 430 a 3 was said to have the meaning 'moisten' (cf. Thomas, 1954, 729 with fn. 144, contra TG, 472 'feucht sein'): *war wipāsi lywāṃ sām śkaṃ* "and she sent him water to moisten", but see chap. Valency 4.10.2. There is no noticeable difference in meaning between the PPt TA *wipo* of the grundverb in A 124 b 5 (*wäryo … wipo* "moistened by water") and the kausativum TA *wipäṣṣäṃ* in A 124 b 2 (*wär wipäṣṣäṃ* "water moistens (the food during digesting)"), but there is most likely a difference in valency. TG, 472 restores a Pt II TA *w(a)wiwār* (for TA *wawipār*) in A 63 a 6, but this remains uncertain despite the fact that there is now a newly discovered Sanskrit parallel version available that is usually quite close to the Tocharian text (Rūpyāvatī-Jātaka, ed. by Hahn, 1992, 56; see Schmidt, 2004, 310ff.), because the Sanskrit text lacks an equivalent of this very passage: ////*w(a)wiwār rotkar pākär pāśinās* "they moistened … [and] they carried away the treasures".

Ετυμ. The TB paradigm seems to be denominative, and the TA forms rather look like primary ones; the same kind of divergence is also met with *naut⁽ᵃ⁾-/ ᴬnut⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'disappear'; for TB *-w-* instead of *-p-*, see Adams, DoT, 614.

[*ᴬwkätkᵃ-* '?' (?) (−)
      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub V — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II *wkätkālune*
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —
Hapax in the bilingual text A 389 a 2; unfortunately, the Sanskrit part is lost and the form is without much further context: //// (·)th(·) • *p(ā)pṣune wkätkālune kle ////.* In any case, TA *wkätk-* is an odd root structure, so I propose to separate and emend to *p(ā)pṣune wkä<m>tkālune* "right behavior (= Skt. *śīla-*), manner, [and] consideration (Skt. *vicara-*) ...". Note that °e *wkät* would not be a regular sandhi outcome of °e *okät* 'eight', because *-e o-* in sandhi usually results in °=*o-*; see Stumpf, 1971a, 106.]

wkän- 'drink' → *auk-* '± set in motion'

ᴬwniskᵃ- '± zerreiben, quälen', '± crush, torment' (tr) (a/-/-)
      Prs VII (a) -,-, *wnisäṅkāṣ;* — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt I in
      PPt *wāwneskunt*
      Ipv —
On the 3.sg. Prs TA *wnisäṅkāṣ,* see Hackstein, 1995, 181f. with ref.; the PPt TA *wāwneskunt* is attested in YQ 2 b 4. Ετυμ. According to Pinault, 1990, 194ff., to be derived from PT *wänäysk- < PIE *u̯i-nik-sḱe/o- from *√neik̑ 'sich erheben' (²LIV, 451 without Toch.) and with the preverb *u̯i- 'apart'; see also Hackstein, 1995, 181ff. According to Hackstein, this root is not a cognate of *nusk-* 'squeeze'.

ᴬwras- 'feel, suffer' → *wärsᵃ?-* '± pity'

[*wrāk-* '?'; a 3.pl. Pt *wrākār* is listed with question mark in WTG 173, § 170 as the only representative of a root *wrāk-*. The hapax is attested in H 149.69 b 4 and co-occurs with another hapax (that cannot even be read with certainty), so the meaning is unknown: *(pā)[tr]i larepi cwi pat/ntuk wrākār ñke* "now *wrākār pat/ntuk* of the dear (fa)ther" (cf. Broomhead I, 158). Itkin, 2004, 163 correctly points out that one can also read *pantu kwrākār*. His further interpretation of *pantu-* as loan from Skt. *bandhu-* 'relative, friend' does also make good sense with *(pā)[tr]i larepi cwi*, but his connection of *kwrākār* with *kwrakar* (572 a 2), a loan from Skt. *kūṭāgāra-* 'upper room, garret', does not suggest itself in this passage semantically, though Itkin is certainly right in stating that the two *ā*-vowels do speak in favor of a loan word.]

*wrāt*ᴮ- 'formen', 'shape, form' (?) (−)
  Prs — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub V — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II *wrātalñe* Priv —
    Inf —
  Pt —
  PPt —
  Ipv —
The subjunctive stem seems to have persistent initial accent.
= ᴬ*wrāt*ᴮ- 'formen', 'shape, form' (?) (−)
  Prs — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
    Inf —
  Sub V — Opt —
    Ger II *wrātal* Abstr II —
  Pt —
  PPt —
  Ipv —
Sᴇᴍ. *ñem wrātalñe* in H 149.add 27 b 2 is the equivalent of Skt. *nāma-rūpa-* 'name and form'; see Couvreur, 1954, 87; Broomhead I, 166f. TA *sne wrātal* in A 387 a 3 translates preceding Skt. *arupi* 'formless, without form'. Eᴛʏᴍ. As per Adams, DoT, 616; evidently a denominative.

ᴬ*wrātk*ᴮ- '± (Fleisch) zubereiten', '± prepare, handle (meat)' (?) (a+/-/-)
  Prs VII (a+) -,-, *wrātäṅkāṣ;* — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part *wrātäṅkāmāṃ*
    Ger I — Abstr I —

```
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
```

In both instances the verb refer to TA *śwāl* 'meat'; the *m*-Part said to come from an unpublished fragment in TG, 473 can now be found in THT 1441 frg. a a 3, and is without further context: //// *(ś)[wā]l wrātaṅkāmāṃ* ////. Schneider, 1940, 200f. was the first to propose a translation 'cook' and to connect the root with Lith. *vérdu* 'cook'; this interpretation has been followed by most scholars (most notably by Melchert, 1978, 120), except K. T. Schmidt, who apud Hartmann, 2001, 109, fn. 63 claims the meaning to be "unsicher"; the forms can indeed refer to any kind of meat handling including, e.g., also 'cutting'; on A 399 b 3, see now Peyrot, in print. Since it is even unclear whether TA *śwāl* is subject or object, the valency remains unclear as well.

*wlāw*ᵃ- 'beherrschen', 'sich zurückhalten', 'control', 'restrain oneself'
```
        (tr) (-/m/m)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V (m) -,-, wlāwatär; — Opt wlāwoymar,-,-; —
                Ger II — Abstr II wlāwalñe Priv awlāwatte
                Inf —
        Pt I (m) -, wlawātai, wlawāte; —
        PPt wawlāwau| wawlāwaṣ
        Ipv I (m) -; pulāwat
```
The 3.sg.mid. Opt *wlāwoytär* in TEB I, 228, § 412,1 is probably only reconstructed. The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. The 2.pl.mid. Ipv *pulāwat* is attested in PK AS 17H b 3 (Pinault, 1988a, 183), and *wawlāwaṣ* in PK AS 17H b 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).
= ᴬ*wlāw*ᵃ- '(sich) beherrschen', 'control (oneself)' (?) (—)
```
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II wlāwlune
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
```
Sᴇᴍ./Eᴛʏᴍ. The middle can have reflexive function, cf. chap. Valency 4.9.3. Hilmarsson, 1991, 43f. connects the root with Ved. *vṛṇoti* 'cover' from PIE

*√u̯el(H) 'einschließen, verhüllen' (²LIV, 674 without Toch.), claiming "a banal development" from 'to cover' to 'to constrict, contain'; however, the underlying noun PT *wälāwæ may rather have been derived from the root *√u̯elH 'stark sein, Gewalt haben' (²LIV, 676f.), cf., e.g., Gk. ἐγκρατής 'having possession of; self-controlled' from Gk. κράτος 'strength, power'.

wlā(-sk)- '± verströmen', '± give off (scent), waft' (tr) (a/-/-)
        Prs II/IX (a) —;-,-, *wlāskeṃ* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
        Pt —
        PP —
        Ipv —

wlāskeṃ were "(the blossoming trees) give off [their] scent" is attested in PK AS 17H a 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). We may be dealing either with a Prs II, or with a Prs IXa. Could it be that in a PT phrase *wärāsk- wæræ the *-r- of the verb was dissimilated to (*)-l-? See also *wälᵖ?-* '± shatter, tousle'.

ᴬ*wles-* 'verrichten, ausüben, errichten, bearbeiten (Boden)', 'perform, build, cultivate (soil)' (tr) (m+/x/m)
        Prs II (m+) -, *wleṣtār, wleṣtär;-,-, wlesantär* Imp —
            nt-Part *wleṣantāñ*
            m-Part *wlesmāṃ*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf *wlessi*
        Sub II (x) — Opt -, *wleṣit,-;— | -,-, wleṣitär;* —
            Ger II *wleṣäl* Abstr II *wleṣlune*
        Pt I (m) *wleṣe,-, wleṣāt;-,-, wleṣānt*
        PPt *wāwleṣu*
        Ipv I (m) *pleṣār;-*

The 3.sg.mid. TA *wleṣāt* that is a couple of times attested in A 255 is rather preterit than imperfect (see Thomas, 1957, 189; Pinault, 2008, 95), and the same is true for TA *wleṣāt* in A 301 a 1 (cf. the passage in Pinault, 2004a, 258), and the 1.sg.mid. TA *wleṣe* in A 270 b 2 (cf. Pinault, 1997, 131). In addition, these forms are now also attested in preterit function in the YQ manuscript, cf. Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1989, 278: 1.sg.mid. TA *wleṣe* (YQ 25 b 8), 3.sg.mid. TA *wleṣāt* (YQ 23 a 8), and 3.pl.mid. TA *wleṣānt* (YQ 24 a 1, although this form is without direct context). SEM. The function of the middle is unclear, according to Schmidt, 1974, 501ff. ETYM. The root evidently forms an equation with *lāṃs-* 'work on, perform, accomplish'; see s.v.

Ś

TA *śalc-* → *tsālt^ā-* 'chew'

śāmp^ā- 'hochmütig sein', 'be conceited' (itr) (—)

        Prs IV — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *śompolle* Abstr I —
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II *śāmpālle* (sic) Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

A present stem form is also to be restored in 428 b 5 *śompo* ////. Adams, DoT, 626, s.v. *śāmpa* calls this noun a "nominal derivative of *śāmp-*", but the verb rather looks like a non-primary formation itself.

śāw- 'leben', 'live' (itr) (a+/a/a)

        Prs II (a+) *śāyau,-, śaiṃ; śayem,-, śāyeṃ* Imp —
                nt-Part *śayeñca*
                m-Part *śamāne* (Š)/*śāmane* (Š)
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub II (a) *śāyau,-,-;-,-, śaweṃ* (sic) Opt *śayim,-, śāyi;* —
                Ger II *śaille* Abstr II *śailñe* Priv —
                Inf *śaitsi*
        Pt I (a) -,-, *śāya;* —
        Pt VII (a) -,-, *śawiya;* —
        PPt *śaśayu* (Š) | *śaśāyoṣ*
        Ipv VI (a) *pśāy(e); pśaiso*

A 2.sg. *śait* (Prs or Sub) is only listed in TochSprR(B), glossary, 177. The 3.pl. Prs variant *śaiṃ* cited by WTG, 295 in 3 b 5 is rather a 3.sg.; see Peyrot, 2008, 139, fn. 227. Peyrot, 2008, 2008, 139f. furthermore correctly points out that it cannot be confirmed by the context that *śaweṃ* (sic) in H 149.42 b 5 is indeed a 3.pl. form from this root and offers an alternative reading for the reason that one would expect †*śāweṃ* in the first place. However, one may take the omission of the *ā*-stroke for a mere writing error. The 3.sg. *śāyi* in H 149.296 a 2 is "eher Opt. als Impf.", according to Couvreur, 1954, 84. The Ger II can be found in THT 1296 a 3: *śaul śaille*. That there also existed an Abstr *śaulyñe* (beside often attested *śail(y)ñe*) to be read in 89 b 1 remains uncertain (see Thomas, ²TochSprR(B), 244; and most recently Schmidt, 2001, 319, fn. 110 and Peyrot, 2008, 140). The class of the imperative is debated. The manuals label the forms as Ipv I, but the plural Ipv *pśaiso* cannot be a regular Ipv I; therefore, Hilmarsson, 1991, 50, fn. 38 doubts that one can restore the (once

attested) 2.sg. Ipv in 404 b 1 to an Ipv I form *pśā[y](a)*, and rather proposes that we have to do with *pśāy(ä)* = *pśāyᵃ*, i.e., an *ā*-less imperative sg. *pśāy*, pl. *pśaiso*, and he is followed by Adams, DoT, 627. However, we may also be dealing with an *e*-imperative of Class VI, i.e., restore to a 2.sg. *pśāy(e)*, to which a 2.pl. *pśaiso* in the Šorčuq 404 text would be the perfectly expected plural (see chap. Ipv 37.6.). The obliquus PPt *śaśāyo(ṣ)* in 96 a 1 is based on an emendation of attested *śaśāy[a]* (TochSprR(B), s.v., with fn. 5; note that an *o*-vowel should still be visible over the sign which is hardly damaged), and this can now be supported by the forms *(śaśā)yoṣṣäṃ* in PK AS 17J b 2 (Pinault, 1994, 116) and *śaśāyo(ṣ)* in IOL Toch 308 b 6 (Peyrot, 2008a, 105). The 3.sg. Pt VII *śawiya* in 576 a 4 also belongs to this root, as per Winter, 1961, 90f. = 1984, 162 = 2005, 29f. In addition, WTG, 295 interprets the highly problematic hapax *śen* in 255 a 7 as a Prs or (shortened) Opt from that root (a misspelling *e* for *ai* is not too problematic; word-final ⟨n⟩ instead of ⟨ṃ⟩ is unusual, but not unattested; note that text 255 is littered with writing errors of a kind that makes one suspect the text was dictated). However, *śen* seems to be transitive (if this is a verbal form at all), and *śai-* 'live' is intransitive. The whole stanza 255 a 6ff. actually runs as follows (| indicates caesura): *keṃ ma tällaṃ yoloy[nä] | ṣek wänträ no w[o]tkäṃ k[r(ᵤ)i] | (kreñc o)nolmi tällān[n]e* (= 254 a 5) *| oṅkolma ra śeruweṃ • yamor ṣṣäññe aknatsā | yāmor ṣṣäññe aiśaumye | śen oṅkolmai śaiṣṣene | ṣäñ yoññiy<ai> wa(–)n m[a].* The quarter pāda *śen oṅkolmai śaiṣṣene* has seven syllables, so we cannot restore another syllable to the form *śen*. Schmidt, 1974, 300 translates the first part: "Die Erde erträgt nicht den Bösewicht (?): Stets verhüllt sie sich (?), wenn er entscheidet (?)" (Saito, 2006, 198: "verhüllt sie ihn"), for the following part cf. also the translation by Adams, DoT, 628: "The fool of the deed and the wiseman of the deed [both] set the elephant in motion" (as for the fact that the text explicitly speaks of a female elephant, one may refer to the fact that it is usually she-elephants that are trained as working animals and hunting mounts). W. Winter (p.c.) proposes the following translation for the whole passage: "The earth does not support evil (?) whenever she decides a matter — it is the people that support it just as the she-elephant supports a hunter. It is a matter of karma whenever a fool or a wise man prods (?) the female elephant; she does not choose her way freely". *wänträ* standing for *wäntre* 'matter' would have to be a misspelling, but note that the text does exactly show this kind of error in *wränta* for *wrenta* in line a 2. Another possibility, in my opinion, is a separation *ṣek <k>wänträ* containing a yet unattested stem **kw-ᵃññ-*, which, however, does not lead anywhere. Winter also proposes to restore *wa(tka)n* from *wätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'decide' in a 7 instead of *wa(ltsna)n*; however, I think that for paleographic reasons, the most likely reading of the damaged akṣara is ⟨ka⟩, i.e., *wakän*, which could, in theory, be a 3.sg. of the Antigv. of *wāk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'split, burst apart' (or *wakänma*, the plural of *wāki* 'difference', which, however, does not seem to fit syntactically).

Kausativum III 'leben', 'live' (itr) (x/-/m)
   Prs IXa (x) *śawaskau*,-, *śawaṣṣäṃ* (M); — | -,-, *śawästär* (MQ); —
     Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I *śāwäṣṣälle* (sic)/*śawaṣṣälle* (Š) Abstr I —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt IV (m) -,-, *śāwṣate* (Š);-,-, *śāwṣante* (Š)
   PPt —
   Ipv —

The 1.sg. *śawaskau* is attested in PK AS 16.7 a 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The present stem has non-initial accent; see Winter, 1961, 93 =1984, 165 = 2005, 32, which is in accordance with the fact that what formally looks like a kausativum has the same intransitive valency as the grundverb; the sole exception is *śāwäṣṣälle* from the small fragment 43 a 3 (standard TB), which is without much context and may therefore be a real causative form denoting 'let live'.

= ᴬ*śäw-* 'leben', 'live' (itr) (a+/a/-)
   Prs II (a+) -, *śot, śoṣ*;-,-, *śāweñc* Imp -, *śāwāṣt*,-;-, *śāwās*,-
     nt-Part —
     m-Part *śāmāṃ*
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf *śotsi*
   Sub II (a) — Opt -,-, *śāwiṣ*;—
     Ger II — Abstr II *śolune*
   Pt I in
   PPt *śāśo*
   Ipv —
Kausativum III 'leben', 'live' (itr) (m/-/-)
   Prs VIII (m) —; *śosamtär*,-,- Imp -,-, *śoṣät-äṃ*;—
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —

Pace TG, 475, the 3.sg. Pt TA *śosā-ṃ* in A 24 a 5 rather belongs to ᴬ*ku-* 'pour'.
Sᴇᴍ. Although basically intransitive, the verb can be construed with *śaul*/TA *śol* in a figura etymologica 'live the life' both in the grundverb and the kausativum. What is formally a kausativum also has the intransitive meaning 'live'. The function of the middle is unclear. Eᴛʏᴍ. Some manuals (TG, WTG,

but not TEB) set up two different roots *śau-* and *śai-*; diachronically, *śai-/śāy-* goes back to PT *śāw'(ä)- with *-'ä- from pre-PT *-e-, and *śau-/śāw-* to PT *śāw- with unpalatalized *-w-. To be derived from PIE *√gʷįeh₃ 'leben' (²LIV, 215f.), i.e., a *u̯e/o*-present with zero grade *gʷih₃-u̯e/o- or full grade *gʷįeh₃-u̯e/o-. For a reconstruction with the full grade, see Klingenschmitt, 1994, 312 = 2005, 355; 1994a, 245 = 2005, 457 with ref. On the other hand, both Hackstein, 1995, 23f., fn. 29, and Ringe, 2000, 125f. prefer to derive the Toch. root from zero-grade *gʷih₃u̯-e/o-. On loss and preservation of *-w-*, see also Þórhallsdóttir, 1988, 198f., and Winter, 1988a, 211ff. = 2005, 346ff. On TA *śāmāṃ* and *śamāne*, see also Winter, 1965a, 205 = 2005, 130. Strangely enough, the nouns *śaul* 'life' and *śaumo* 'man' at first glance seem to imply that there once also existed a PT athematic stem *śāwä-; but probably the ancestor forms of these two words rather had been formed so early that the basis on which they were built had still to be the bare root and not any verbal stem derived by a suffix from the bare root.

śäṅk- → *śiṅk-* '?'

śä(-nāsk)- '?' (?) (—)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub ? — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *śnāssi*
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

W. Winter (p.c.) proposes to restore a PPt *(śe)śśiyu* in 600 b 4, which would form an equation with TA *śaśyu*. Because of the preserved *-ā-*, the infinitive form cannot belong to a kausativum paradigm. If the TB root is indeed a cognate of ᴬ*śi-*, the TB Inf will be based on an *-sk-* enlargement of a nasal present in PT *-nā- that was attached to the lautgesetzlich outcome of a zero-grade root allomorph pre-PT *ki-, whereas the TA Inf *śināssi* would show either the lautgesetzlich outcome of either a pre-PT *e*-grade allomorph *keį- or a pre-PT zero-grade allomorph *kī- as if from Very Early pre-PT *kiH- with analogically introduced laryngeal or at least vowel length, or an analogical outcome of that zero-grade root allomorph pre-PT *ki-.

~ ᴬ*śi-* '?' (?) (—)
        Prs X — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *śināssi*
        Sub — Opt —

     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt III in
   PPt *śaśyu*
   Ipv —

Synchronically, TA *śinässi* implies a Prs X from a root with A-character, and if TA *śaśyu* in A 69 a 2 is a PPt of this root (as per TG, 474), we have to do with a root ᴬ*śi⁽ᵃ⁾*- that behaved like ᴬ*yom⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'achieve'.

Sᴇᴍ./Eᴛʏᴍ. The Inf forms are hapax legomena in both languages: 405 b 7 *yärkeṣṣe warkṣäl śnässi mā campya* "die Gewalt der Verehrung vermochte er nicht auszudrücken (??)" (thus WTG, 121, § 120, fn. 4); A 399 a 6: //// *wsokoneṣiṃ wärkṣälyo śkā śinässi cämpäṣ* "durch die Macht der Freude vermag er noch (?) auszudrücken (??)" (thus WTG, l.c.; TG, 474 also restores this infinitive at the beginning of line b 2). Couvreur, 1956, 71 proposes for the TA root as meaning "etwa 'zufrieden sein'", Adams, DoT, 642 translates 405 b 7 by "he couldn't release the power of praise" and assumes the TB nasal present is a substitute of the PIE nasal present *kih₂-neu̯- from PIE *√k̂/kei̯h₂ 'sich in Bewegung setzen' (²LIV, 346 without Toch.). There are various possible meanings for TA *śaśyu* in A 69 a 2.

śänm- 'binden, fesseln; festlegen (Regeln)', 'bind; determine (rules)'
   (tr) (m+/a/x)
   Prs IXb (m+) -, *śanmästār* (MQ), *śanmästär;-, śanmästär,*
     śanmäskentär Imp —
     nt-Part *śanmäṣṣeñca*
     m-Part —
     Ger I *śanmäṣṣälle* Abstr I —
   Sub IXb (a) — Opt -,-, *śanmäṣṣi-ne/śänmaṣṣi* (MQ); —
     Ger II *śänmäṣlye* (MQ) Abstr II *śaṃmäṣṣälñe* (MQ) Priv —
     Inf *śanmässi*
   Pt II (x) -,-, *śānmya;-,-, śānmyāre* (sic)/*śānmyar-ne* |
     -, *śānmyatai, śānmyate;* —
   PPt *śeśśanmu* | *śeśśanmoṣ/śceśänmoṣ*
   Ipv —

A 1.sg. Opt *śanmäṣṣim* is only listed in TochSprR(B), glossary, 175, the 3.sg. Opt variant *śänmaṣṣi* is attested in THT 1314 a 5 (MQ): *śänmaṣṣi waṭ* *prutka[ṣṣ](i)* "or would bind [and] block". A 3.pl.mid. Prs *(śanmä)skentär* can be restored on account of the Sanskrit parallel version in PK NS 107 a 4; see Thomas, 1977, 109, and a Ger I *śa(nm)ä(ṣa)le* is also to be restored in 503 b 1, according to K. T. Schmidt, apud SHT 3, 902, and 2000, 227. The form *śänmäṣlye* in 284 b 2 does not need to be a misspelling for an Abstr *śänmäṣlñe*, because it can be analyzed as a substantivized Ger; the Abstr *śaṃmäṣṣälñe* is attested in 164 b 1. The 3.pl. Pt variant *śānmyar-ne* with loss of -*e* before the clitic is attested in THT 1507 a 4 (see Peyrot, 2008, 135). In 589 b 8 TochSprR(B) restores a 1.pl.mid. Pt *(śānmya)mte.* Sᴇᴍ. The middle functions as passive or has the same meaning as the active (e.g., in 308 b 5; see

Schmidt, 1974, 498). Eᴛʏᴍ. Word-initial (pre-)PT *st- rather than *k- (as still assumed by Klingenschmitt, 1994, 409 = 2005, 433, who set up a "*kemh-ske-") seems to be implied by the initial śc- found in the obl.sg. of the PPt śce[ś]ä(n)[m]oṣ in TX 1 (= THT 1350) a 3 (MQ), provided the manuscript pieces are indeed to be joined in the way suggested by Thomas, 1974, 79. As a matter of fact, Schmidt, 1992, 106ff.; 1994a, 228; 1995, 273f. derived the root from an inherited nasal present in PIE *-n(e)H- made from the root PIE *√stembʰH 'stützen' (²LIV, 595; there the root is quite incorrectly glossed as 'sich stützen, sich stemmen' as a consequence of both the assumption that stäm⁽ᵃ⁾-/ᴬṣtäm⁽ᵃ⁾- 'stand' derives from this PIE root as well and ignoring the causative alternation phenomenon); the reconstruction of original *-mbʰ- is backed by Peters' explanation of the enigmatic -y- found in the Pt II (Peters, 2006, 341, fn. 32); the former existence of a pre-TB verbal stem *śämnā- (not to be derived from *śä-śámnā- and therefore still lacking the reduplication syllable presupposed by the initial accent of the Prs/Sub IXb) as predicted by Schmidt's etymology is indeed suggested by śanmau, pl. śänmānma 'fetter, bond'; see Malzahn, 2005, 396. (Substitution of root-final *-ā- by -ä- could, of course, be expected in a IXb formation.) Connecting the root with PIE *√demh₂ 'zähmen, bändigen, gefügig machen' (²LIV, 116f.) as advocated by Evangelisti and most recently by Hilmarsson 1991b, 161ff. is also quite improbable for the reason that PT *ts'- never resulted in ś- in any other verbal form of Tocharian B.

[śäts- 'schlagen (?)' (WTG, 294) is a ghost root; see Couvreur, 1954, 83.]

*śärs*ᵃ- '?' (?) (—)
      Prs III — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I śärselle Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —
Unclear hapax in Fill. W 11 a 4f.: platkāre mäśśakene a(ṣi)ye śärselle se laiko ārkwi yamaṣäṃ "bei Ausschlag (?) [und] Gelbsucht (?) [ist] Ziegen[milch] hinzuzufügen (?) (die Bedeutung des nur hier belegten śärselle bleibt unsicher); dieses als Bad macht weiß"; see Sieg, 1955, 73f., followed by Broomhead I, 13. D. Q. Adams (p.c.) suggests that the form refers to 'whey' or 'cream' and can in this case be connected with PIE *k̂/kers 'run' (Lat. currō), because 'whey' is the runny part of the milk residue (see now ²DoT, s.v. śärselle).

[*śiṅk-* '?' (?) (-/a/-)

The manuals (e.g., WTG, 60, § 62, fn.) set up a verbal root *śäṅk-* '± delay,
          hesitate' to be derived from PIE *√k̑enk 'in der Schwebe sein, hängen'
          (²LIV, 325 without Toch.) on the evidence of a restored 2.sg.
          ś[i]ṅk[a](t) in the difficult business letter 495 (= H 150.103) b 1. Pace
          TochSprR(B), Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 258 now prefers the
          following reading and restoration: *ceyna cāneṃ l[au] c(ä)rkāwa-ś*
          (p)o [p]re[k]sau-śm(eṃ) po ś[i]ṅk[as] aiskau //// (for the preceding
          sentence, see s.v. *kut-* 'eliminate'). Apart from the question of the
          correct restoration of the last, unreadable akṣara, the form seems
          rather to be a noun. One may translate: "These *cāneṃ* I left with you.
          I ask all [back ?] from you. All *śiṅka(s)* I shall give." Another possible
          form of this word may be attested in the small fragment THT 1526
          frg. a b 1 (M): *//// (yä)lts[e]nmasa śiṅkā ////*, where it is constructed
          with the perlative of 'thousand'.]

ᴬ*śi-* → *śä(-nāsk)-* '?'

śuwᴬ- 'essen, konsumieren', 'eat, consume' (tr) (x/a/x)
          Prs V (x) -, *śwāt, śuwaṃ;-,-, śuwaṃ/śwāṃ-ne | -,-, śwātär;—*
                    Imp —;-,-, *śwoyeṃ/śawon/śwoṃ*
                    nt-Part *śawāñca* (Š)
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I *śwālle* Abstr I —
          Sub V (a) *śū,-, śuwaṃ/ śūwaṃ;-,-, śuwaṃ/śwā-ñ* Opt -,-, *śuwoy;—*
                    Ger II *śwālle* Abstr II — Priv *eśuwacca*
                    Inf *śwātsi*
          Pt I (x) -, *śawāsta, śuwa/ śāwa;-,-, śawāre/śawār | -,-, śawāte;—*
          PPt *śeśu |* in *śeśuwer*
          Ipv —
A 3.pl. Opt or Imp is also attested in the small fragment THT 1200 a 4: *śwātsi*
śuwoṃ •. The 1.sg. Sub *śū* is attested in PK NS 58 b 2, according to Pinault,
1994, 136ff., esp. 170ff. Pace Thomas, 1958, 306, one cannot restore a 2.sg. Sub
śuwat in M 135.2 (= SHT 7, 1704), as per Schmidt, 1990, 476f.; 1994, 270f., and
2000, 233. The 2.sg. Pt *śawāsta* is attested three times in KVāc 15 (Schmidt,
1986, passim), and also in THT 1540 frg. a + b a 3 (Schmidt, 2007, 325). The
3.sg. Pt *śāwa* is found twice in documents of profane nature from the Paris
collection (PK Cp 35, 2 and PK Cp 38, 3), in the literary text 250 a 2, and
probably in 534 a 3, whereas the 3.sg. Pt variant *śuwa* is attested as TB gloss
on the TA form 3.sg. Pt *tāp* in A 394 b 1; note further that *śāwa* in PK Cp 38, 3
was corrected from original *śuwa* (see Peyrot, 2008, 145 with fn. 244). For the
3.pl. Pt *śawār* attested in the business document SI B Toch./9, 12f., see Pinault,
1998, 4. The "durative" 3.sg. Pt *śawiya* listed as form of this root by WTG, 294
belongs to *śāw-* 'live', as per Winter, 1961, 90f. = 1984, 162 = 2005, 29f.

= ^{A}*śuw^ä-* 'essen', 'eat' (tr) (a+/-/-)

      Prs V (a+) *śwām, śwāt, śwāṣ;-,-, śweñc* Imp —

              nt-Part *śwānt*

              m-Part *śwāmāṃ*

              Ger I — Abstr I —

              Inf *śwātsi*

      Sub V — Opt —

              Ger II *śwāl* Abstr II —

      Pt —

      PPt —

      Ipv —

TA *śwāl* is only attested as a noun by the meaning 'meat', so that it is to be analyzed as Ger II, i.e., formed from the subjunctive stem (see Thomas, 1952, 62 with fn. 1). ^{A}*tāp^ä-* 'eat' provides the suppletive finite subjunctive stem, preterit stem, and PPt (no imperative form is attested).

SEM. The middle is always used as a passive (see Schmidt, 1974, 207). In business documents the verb can refer to consuming in a boarder sense (e.g., *saṅkantse śeśu* "consumed by the monastery"; see Pinault, 1994b, 108), and maybe even to non-food stuff in the case of the object *ṣārwai* 'wool', according to Pinault, 1998, 13; D. Q. Adams (p.c.) suggests that since the attestations of *ṣarwiye, ṣārwai* published so far point to a product gained from *female* sheep and goats it may refer to 'cheese' (according to him maybe a cognate of Albanian *gjizë* (< *ṣr̥di̯o-) and Lat. *serum* 'whey') — see now ^{2}DoT, s.v. *ṣarwiye*; very differently Schmidt, 1997, 244ff., whose interpretation of the line SI B Toch./9, 11 is quite bizarre with regard to the further contents of this letter, which he neither mentions nor discusses. ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√ĝi̯eu̯H 'kauen' (^{2}LIV, 168); see Winter, 1965, 199f. = 2005, 115f.; Schmidt, 1982, 365; and Pinault, 1994, 174ff., but the details are tricky. At least the stem allomorphs TB/TA *śwā-/* TB *śuwa-* of the sg.act. forms of the Prs and the Sub are best derived from a PIE = pre-PT *e*-grade of the root; as for the 1.sg.act. Sub *śū*, its shape (that is, the absence of any visible reflex of stem-final (*)-wā-) can be neatly explained in the terms of the synchronic rule detected by Winter, 1965, 204 = 2005, 120 (quite differently Pinault, 1994, 176, who prefers to derive the form from a Very Early pre-PT "*$gyuH$-ō*, ou bien *$gyewH$-ō*"). As for the TB Pt I, at a first glance the forms with *śawā-* and the 3.sg. *śāwa* seem to suggest origin in a PIE *o*-grade formation (thus Kümmel apud ^{2}LIV, 168, fn. 5), but then there is also the finite preterit form *śuwa*. This form was taken for the 1.sg.act. of a Pt III by Couvreur, 1954, 87 and Hackstein, 1995, 51, fn. 22 (who then also took the PPt *śeśu* for a Pt III form), but as a matter of fact, *śuwa* is neither a 1.sg., nor "in den Pariser Klosterrechnungen mehrfach belegt" (as claimed by Hackstein, l.c.), but a 3.sg. and only attested (almost) twice, i.e., in the TA manuscript A 394 b 1 as TB gloss of 3.sg. TA *tāp* and as the original form (corrected into *śāwa*) in the monastery record PK Cp 38,3 (see above). It is then a most likely guess that the TB Pt I paradigm from this root had started out as 3.sg. *śuwa*, 3.pl. *śawāre*, that is, had showed the same kind of root ablaut regularly met in the respective TA Pt I paradigms (pre-TB

*śæw- probably having been preserved and not analogically replaced by
*śāw- due to an especially high frequency of the 3.pl.act. form; for other traces
of such a TA-like inflexion in Tocharian B, see chap. Pt I 7.1.3.5.), and that only
later *śāwā- was generalized in the whole Pt I paradigm of standard
Tocharian B (although still preserved in the informal and eastern varieties of
Tocharian B), owed to the fact that paradigms with an (*)ä/ā-ablaut otherwise
hardly existed at least in standard Tocharian B. (As it seems, (*)śāwā- finally
spread also into the 3.pl.act. Imp and from there even into the -nt- participle.)
As for the PPt śeśu, which accordingly cannot be assigned to a Pt III, see
Winter, 1965, 204 = 2005, 120 and also (implicitly) Peters, 2006, 336, fn. 17 and
346, fn. 51.

^{A} *śur^ä-* 'sich sorgen', 'be concerned' (itr) (m/-/-)

        Prs III (m) -,-, *śuratär;-, śuracär,-* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *śural* Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 2.pl.mid. Prs TA *śuracär* is attested in YQ 13 b 7. Etym. As Winter, 1980,
439 = 2005, 221 points out correctly, the noun TA *śurām* 'sorrow' presupposes
a subjunctive stem beginning with *ś°* as well, so that the palatal initial cannot
simply be explained as feature of the present stem. Evidently a denominative
to an *e*-grade *ro*-stem, maybe a pre-PT *deu̯-ro- belonging with Gk. δεύτερος
'second', etc.

śer- 'jagen', 'hunt' (?) (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub IV — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *śerītsi*
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Obviously a *i̯e/o*-denominative to an ancestor of *śer(u)we/* TA *śaru* 'hunter',
which is usually taken for inherited from PIE (see the ref. in Adams, DoT,
634); differently, Pinault, 2006b, 179ff. assumes that the noun is rather a loan
(accepted by Cheung, 2007, 338 s.v. *saru̯).

Aśew-iññ- 'gähnen', 'yawn' (itr) (m/-/-)
       Prs XII (m) -,-, *śewiṃtär;*— Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
       Sub XII — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II *śewiñlune*
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

ETYM. According to Adams, apud Hilmarsson, 1991a, 91ff. (cf. VW I, 479), we may be dealing with a denominative based on an *n*-stem PT "*śæiwän-*" from pre-PT "*ĝʰeH₁i̯-u̯n̥*" [sic!] (from PIE *√ĝʰeh₁i̯ 'gähnen', ²LIV, 173f. without Toch.); according to Hackstein, 2002a, 229, *w* is merely a hiatus glide.

śai- 'live' → *śāw-* 'id.'

Aśo- 'live' → *Aśāw-* 'id.'

[*śow-* '?', Adams, DoT, 635 proposes that one may restore a present form of
       Class IV in 143 a 5 (rather a 2.sg. *śowota(r)*, because the manuscript
       has *śowota*). Since the form is isolated, this remains possible but
       uncertain.]

śau- 'live' → *śāw-* 'id.'

śauk- 'call' → *kauk-* 'id.'

śnask- → *śä(-nāsk)-* '?'

Ṣ

ṣäṃs- 'zählen, betrachten als', 'count, count as' (tr) (x/-/m)
       Prs II (x) -,-, *ṣäṃṣaṃ* (sic);— | -,-, *ṣaṃṣtär;-,-, ṣäṃsentär* (MQ)
            Imp —;-,-, *ṣäṃṣyentär*
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *ṣäṃsemane*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub II — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II *ṣäṃṣalñe* Priv —
            Inf —
       Pt I (m) -,-, *ṣäṃṣāte;*—
       PPt —
       Ipv —

The active form *ṣäṃṣaṃ* //// is attested in H add.149 86 a 2, so one may think of restoring a clitic pronoun in order to explain the accent. Since abstracts are rarely derived from the present stem, I set up a respective subjunctive stem of Class II for *ṣäṃṣalñe*. A Ger (I or II) *ṣaṃṣalle* is probably attested in THT 1860 b 3, the 3.sg.mid. Pt *ṣäṃṣāte* is found in PK AS 15D b 4 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

KAUSATIVUM III 'betrachten als', 'count, count as' (tr) (a/-/-)

```
        Prs IX (a)  —;-,- ṣänäskeṃ (sic) Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
```

SEM. The verb has the concrete meaning 'count something' (e.g., in 41 a 7), and just like Skt. *gaṇaya-* it can also have the figurative meaning 'count as'. This figurative meaning is possibly also found with *ṣänäskeṃ* (Š) in 522 a 3, which is usually (WTG, 94, § 93, fn. 2) analyzed as kausativum form of this root: *(a)lāṣmoṃ ṣänäskeṃ epe no ṣärnemeṃ* ////, cf. the translation by Couvreur, 1954c, 112: "als (z)ieke zal men hem rekenen of uit handen ..." (i.e., "one will count him as an ill person"), so that the *sk*-stem formation does not seem to have a causative meaning. In any case, *ṣänäskeṃ* cannot be a correct form. The middle forms seem to have the same semantics as the active ones. ETYM. K. T. Schmidt (apud EWAia II, 836, "Nachträge" ad *śaṃs*) compares the root with Ved. √*śaṃs* 'preisen, feierlich aussprechen' from PIE *√(s)k̂ens '(zweckgebunden) zählen', the semantic development being 'der Reihe nach zählend bzw. aufzählend' → 'bewerten, einschätzen'. For the traditional derivation from the PIE number *sem 'one', see Adams, DoT, 653, but with respect to his claims about preservation of the nasal before *-s-*, see s.v. *mān(t)s⁽ᵃ⁾-* .

ṣäm- 'sitzen, bleiben', 'sit, remain' (itr) (a+/-/-)

```
        Prs II (a+) ṣamau,-, ṣamäṃ;-, ṣamcer, ṣameṃ
                Imp -,-, ṣami;-, ṣmīcer, ṣamyeṃ
                nt-Part ṣmeñca
                m-Part ṣmemane
                Ger I ṣmalle Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
```

The root provides the suppletive present stem of *läm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sit'. The 2.pl. Prs *ṣamcer* is attested in IOL Toch 407 b 1 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.).

= *ᴬṣäm-* 'sitzen, bleiben', 'sit, remain' (itr) (a/-/-)

    Prs II (a) -,-, *ṣmäṣ;-, ṣmac, ṣmeñc* Imp *ṣmāwā,-, ṣmā;—*

        nt-Part —

        m-Part —

        Ger I *ṣmäl* Abstr I —

        Inf *ṣämtsi*

    Sub — Opt —

        Ger II — Abstr II —

    Pt —

    PPt —

    Ipv —

The root provides the suppletive present stem of *ᴬläm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sit'.

SEM. The verb is basically intransitive (just like *ᴬᴮläm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sit'), and again just like *ᴬᴮläm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sit', it can be construed with the obliquus of *ost*/TA *waṣt* 'house' and TB *ompalskoññe* 'meditation' in the sense of 'staying at home' = "being *gr̥hastha*, householder', respectively 'meditate' (see Kölver, 1965, 112, and ²TochSprR(B), 221). ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√sed 'sich setzen' (²LIV, 513f., without Toch.); root-final *-d- was bound to be lost by sound law, but the loss compensated by -*m*- taken over from the suppletive root *läm⁽ᵃ⁾-* in order to regain a suitable root structure, according to G.-J. Pinault (p.c.).

ṣärk- 'übertreffen', 'surpass' (tr) (m/-/m)

    Prs IXb (m) -,-, *ṣarkästär;—* Imp —

        nt-Part —

        m-Part *ṣärkäskemane* (MQ)

        Ger I — Abstr I —

    Sub — Opt —

        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

        Inf —

    Pt II (m) -, *ṣārkatai, ṣārkate;—*

    PPt *ṣeṣṣirku*

    Ipv —

Beside the MQ forms *ṣärkästrä* in 284 a 1 and *ṣarkästär* in 345 a 4 (not in WTG), *ṣarkästrä* with initial accent is also attested in the non-MQ texts THT 1344 frg. 3 b 2 and in IOL Toch 414 b 2. The 2.sg.mid. Pt *ṣārkatai* and 3.sg.mid. Pt *ṣārkate* are also found in THT 3597 (= Mainz 655, 1) a 4 and a 6 (cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1983a, 273).

= *ᴬṣärk-* 'übertreffen', 'surpass' (tr) (m/-/-)

    Prs VIII (m) -,-, *ṣärkäṣtär;—* Imp —

        nt-Part —

        m-Part —

        Ger I — Abstr I —

        Inf —

Sub — Opt —
   Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt II in
PPt *ṣaṣärku*
Ipv —

SEM. The middle forms are not passive, the function of the middle is unclear (cf. Schmidt, 1974, 505ff.). ETYM. Winter, 1980b, 555 = 1984, 248 = 2005, 242 interprets the verbal stem as kausativum of *särk⁽ᵃ⁾-*, for which he sets up the meaning 'steigen lassen'; but see s.v. *särk⁽ᵃ⁾-*. For the standard etymology with Hitt. *šarku-* 'eminent, illustrious, powerful', see most recently Kloekhorst, 2008, 734.

ṣärtt?- 'antreiben', 'incite' (tr) (m/-/-)
   Prs IX (m) -,-, *ṣarttastär;* — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt II/III in
   PPt *ṣeṣartu*
   Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. Prs *ṣarttastär* is according to TEB II, "Berichtigungen", 263 attested in an unpublished text. It may be a Class IX form with initial accent and preservation of stem-final *-ā-.
= ᴬ*ṣärtw-* 'antreiben', 'incite' (tr) (-/a/-)
   Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub IX (a) -,-, *ṣärttwāṣ-äm;*– Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt II/III in
   PPt *ṣaṣärttwu*
   Ipv —

There are some doubts about the reading of TA *(ṣa)ṣärttwāṣäm* in A 69 a 6 (cf. TG, 476; Poucha, TLT, 340). TochSprR(A) reads *tā[k] (ṣa)ṣärttwāṣäm*, but in the "Verbesserungen und Nachträge", p. 252 Sieg/Siegling rather propose: "lies *tā – ṣärttwāṣäm.* Die Ergänzung *(ṣa)* erscheint uns jetzt nicht mehr gerechtfertigt". To be sure, the upper part of the damaged akṣara cannot be anything else than a ⟨ka⟩ without a dependent vowel on it (but theoretically, we could also be dealing with a ⟨ku⟩): *tā[k](·)a ṣärttwāṣäm.*
ETYM. See Adams, DoT, 655. To judge from the root structure, we have to do with a denominative which, however, inflected like a primary verb, exactly

like — and possibly on the model of — rhyming PT *s'p'ärtw- standing beside PT *spārtwā- (see s.v. *spārtt⁽ᵃ⁾-).

ᴬ*ṣärtw- 'incite' → *ṣärtt?- 'id.'

*ṣärp- 'hinweisen, unterweisen, erklären', 'indicate, explain, instruct' (tr) (x/a/a)

       Prs VIII (x) -,-, *ṣärṣpäṃ (sic);-,-, *ṣarpseṃ | — ;-,-, *ṣärpsentär-ne

          Imp —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part *ṣärpsemane

          Ger I — Abstr I —

       Sub II (a) *ṣarpau-me (sic)/*ṣärpau-me,-,-; —

          Opt -, *ṣärpit (MQ), *ṣarpi; —

          Ger II — Abstr II *ṣärpalñe Priv —

          Inf *ṣarptsi

       Pt III (a) -,-, *ṣerpsa;-,-, *ṣerpar-me

       PPt *ṣeṣärpu | *ṣeṣarpoṣ

       Ipv —

A 1.sg. *(ṣä)rpṣim* is restored in H 149.add 113 b 3 by Broomhead I, 163, but Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 155 now rather reads *(–)rṣṣim*. The nom.sg. PPt *ṣeṣärpu* is attested in PK AS 7K b 1 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), a *(ṣe)[ṣä]rpuwer* is further found in 620 a 5.

= ᴬ*ṣärp- 'hinweisen, unterweisen, erklären', 'indicate, explain, instruct' (tr) (a/a/a)

       Prs VIII (a) —;-,-, *ṣärpseñc Imp —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part *ṣärpäsmāṃ

          Ger I — Abstr I —

          Inf —

       Sub VII (a) — Opt *ṣärpñim,-,-; —

          Ger II — Abstr II —

       Sub IX (a) — Opt -,-, *ṣärpāṣiṣ; —

          Ger II — Abstr II *ṣärpāṣlune

       Pt II (a) -,-, *ṣaṣärp; —

       PPt *ṣaṣärpu

       Ipv —

As for the optative form TA *ṣärpāṣi(–)* in A 463 a 4, despite the caveat of Couvreur, 1967, 164, a 3.sg.act. TA *ṣärpāṣi(ṣ)* is the most likely guess. The existence of a Sub IX stem beside the Sub VII is certain in any case because of the Abstr attested in the compound TA *ṣoma-ṣä(r)p(ā)ṣlune-yumäñcsā* in A 353 a 5, which can be restored on account of the Sanskrit equivalent *ekoddeśaiḥ* (instr.pl.) "nach einer einzigen Anweisung handelnd"; see Schmidt, 1989, 74. Eᴛʏᴍ. As per Adams, DoT, 656 (labial extension of PIE *√ser 'tie' or PIE *√sᵤer 'speak (solemnly)').

ṣi- '± herausfließen lassen', '± drain' (tr) (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub IXb — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *ṣissi*
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

= *Aṣi-* '± herausfließen lassen', '± drain' (tr) (—)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf *ṣissi*
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The TB Inf *[ṣi]s(·)i* is read by Thomas, 1966a, 179 with fn. 5 in S 8 b 1 on account of the parallel *////ss[i]* in 104 a 1, but he does not give a translation for the passage. Thomas furthermore refers to the TA parallel A 311 b 6 *ysāräṃ ṣi – – •* without proposing a restoration. Adams, 1982, 134f.; DoT, 691 restores TA *ṣi(ssi)* in A 311 b 6 (the ink traces on the manuscript indeed speak in favor of *ss*) and proposes a meaning 'drain' because of the respective objects *ysāra*/TA *ysāräṃ* 'blood': "to drain the blood". According to Adams, l.c., the TB PPt *siyau* of the grundverb may be attested in the fragmentary text 324 b 1. Differently, Schmidt, 1974, 93f., fn. 5 connects the isolated PPt *siyau* in 324 b 1 with *siy*ᵃ- 'sweat'.

Eᴛʏᴍ. As per Adams, DoT, 691 (PIE *√seį̯ 'drip, run, moisten').

*Aṣkit*ᵃ- '± scheinen', '± appear, seem' (itr) (m/-/-)

        Prs V (m) —;-,-, *ṣkitāntär* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Hapax restored by Sieg, Übers. II, 9, fn. 19 in A 58 a 6: *ñäktañ ñäkcyäs wimāntwäṣ litatsy oki ṣkitā(ntär)* "die Götter scheinen (?) gleichsam von den göttlichen Palästen herabzufallen".

A ṣtār^{B?}- 'ermüden, müde werden', 'become tired' (itr) (-/-/a)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt I (a) -,-, *ṣtār*; —
    PPt *ṣāṣtru*
    Ipv —

The PPt TA *ṣāṣtru* is attested in YQ 6 b 3. According to Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 108, fn. 7, the same root also underlies the noun TA *ṣtare* "Anstrengung" in A 278 b 2. The same passage A 278 b 2 may also contain a finite preterit form TA *ṣtār*, because the complex TA *pukloṣtār* (thus read by TochSprR(A); Poucha, TLT, 184) can also be separated into TA *pu klo ṣtār*, i.e., *pu<k> klo ṣtār*; see the detailed argument in Pinault, 1994c, 383ff., who also refers to the Old Turkish parallel MaitrHami (IV) 7 b: "Obwohl wir uns bemühten, jenen zu verstehen, indem wir unsere guten Werke und Tugenden, die wir seit vierzig Kalpas bzw. sechzig Kalpa-Perioden angehäuft hatten, hervorbrachten, haben wir es nicht geschafft und konnten jenen Mönch nicht verstehen" (as translated by Geng/Klimkeit, 1988, 243). Accordingly, Pinault, 1994c, 388 reads and translates A 278 b 2: *säksäk śtwarāk kalpaṣi ṣtare wasäṃ pu klo ṣtār śmām knānmune* "L'effort de soixante [et] quarante kalpas fut mis en avant par nous, [mais] notre connaissance (de ce moine) resta telle qu'elle était" (TA *klo* is PPt of *käl^{(a)}-* 'lead'). Whereas Pinault interprets TA *ṣtār* as an adverb referring to TA *śmā-m* ("rester immoble", TA *ṣtār* < PIE *sth$_2$-ró-), Schmidt, 1999b, 280 interprets TA *ṣtār* in A 278 b 2 — without discussion or reference to Pinault, 1994c — as a 3.sg. Pt from this root claimed by him to be an equivalent of Skt. √*śram* 'sich abmühen, müde werden, ermüden'. If Schmidt's interpretation is correct, one would have to translate (while separating TA *puk lo*?) "our effort lasting 60 [times] 40 kalpas has tired us completely (?) [but/and] the knowledge remained (or: increased) for us" (for TA *śmā-m*, see below s.v. *stäm^{(a)}-*/*^A ṣtäm^{(a)}-* 'stand', and *^A tsäm^{(a)}-* 'increase').

^A ṣtäm^{(a)}- 'stand' → *stäm^{(a)}-* 'id.'

S

satāsk- 'exhale' → *sāt^a-sk-* 'id.'

sanāp^a- 'anoint' → *sānāp^a-* 'id.'

^A**say-** 'satiate' → *soy-* 'id.'

sāk^(a)- 'zurückbleiben', 'remain over, remain behind' (itr) (—)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I in
        PPt *sasākauwa*
        Ipv —
ANTIGRUNDVERB mid. 'bleiben, sich zurückhalten', 'remain, restrain oneself'
        (itr) (m/-/-)
        Prs VIII (m) -,-, *sakṣtär* (MQ); — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
It can be assumed that the stem is basically transitive and that we have to do
with a middle in anticausative function (cf. the active TA cognate) or in
reflexive function: 520 b 2 *(poy)ś(i)ntaṃts no nanāku su ṣañ añm s(a)kṣtär
empa(lkaitte)* "aber vom (Alleswissenden) getadelt, hält er sich selbst
unbekü(mmert) zurück" (Schmidt, 1974, 316); 555, 3 //// *(pe)laikne sakṣträ se
śaul ṣpä musketär* "... das Gesetz bleibt, dies Leben [aber] schwindet"
(Schmidt, 1974, 138).
KAUSATIVUM II 'zurückhalten, zurücklassen', 'restrain, leave behind' (tr) (a/-/-)
        Prs IXb (a) -,-, *sākäṣṣäṃ;* — Imp —
                nt-Part *sākäṣṣeñca*
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub IXb — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *sākässi*

Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

An Inf *sākässi* is only listed in TEB II, 253.

= ^A*sāk*^(ä)- 'bleiben', 'remain' (itr) (m/a/a)

Prs IV (m) —;-,-, *sakantär* Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Inf —
Sub V (a) —;-,-, *sākeñc* Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt I (a) -,-, *sāk*;—
PPt —
Ipv —

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'zurückhalten', 'restrain' (tr) (-/a/-)

Prs VIII — Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Inf *sākässi*
Sub VII (a) — Opt *sākñim*,-,-;—
Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The Inf in A 7 a 3 has the meaning 'restrain oneself' (just like the reflexive middle Prs VIII in TB), being construed with TA *āñcäm* 'self'. The context of the Sub TA *sākñim* in A 123 b 4 is unclear; for its status, cf. Hilmarsson, 1991a, 67f.

sāt^ä*-sk-* 'ausatmen', 'exhale' (itr) (a+/-/-)

Prs IXa (a+) -,-, *satāṣṣäṃ*;— Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part *satāskemane*
Ger I in *satāṣṣälleṣṣe* Abstr I —
Sub IXa — Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II *satāṣlñe* Priv —
Inf *satāstsy*
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The Inf *satāstsy* is said to be attested by Thomas, 1972, 443, fn. 5, but he gives no reference. The stem is a secondary *sk*-extension of an A-character root *sāt*^ä- (cf. *an*^(ä)*-sk-* 'breathe', the model of which this root may be based). Further connections are uncertain, cf. Adams, DoT, 673.

sānāp^ā- 'salben, einreiben', 'anoint' (tr) (m/-/-)

      Prs I (m) -,-, *sonoptär;* — Imp -,-, *sonopitär;* —

           nt-Part —

           m-Part —

           Ger I *sonopälle* Abstr I —

      Sub V — Opt —

           Ger II *sanāpalle* Abstr II — Priv —

           Inf *sanāpatsi*

      Pt —

      PPt —

      Ipv —

SEM. The verb is transitive, the middle voice having clearly reflexive function in Fill. W 40 b 3f.: *se ce ṣalype sonopträ* – – – *wikentär-ne* "wer sich dieses Öl einreibt, dem vergehen ..." (Sieg, 1955, 78; Schmidt, 1974, 307 and 355). Note, however, that we have to do with an old member of Prs Class IV; see chap. Prs III/IV 26.3. ETYM. Maybe a loan from pre-Khotanese *zənāf-, as per Adams, 1988, 403, and DoT, 674.

^A^*sām^ā?-* 'an sich nehmen, aufbewahren, sammeln', 'take, keep, gather'

      (tr) (-/-/m)

      Prs — Imp —

           nt-Part —

           m-Part —

           Ger I — Abstr I —

           Inf —

      Sub — Opt —

           Ger II — Abstr II —

      Pt I (m) -,-, *sāmat;* —

      PPt in *sāsmurāṣ*

      Ipv I (m) *psāmār;-*

ETYM. Probably a denominative to an adverb of the type Gk. ὁμῆ 'together'. One could also toy with the idea that the forms attested from this root originally formed one single paradigm together with those attested from ^A^*sum^ā-* 'take away of, deprive of', but this is neither recommended by the semantics nor by what is clearly a TB cognate of the latter TA root.

sāmp^(ā)- 'wegnehmen', 'take away, deprive of' (tr) (m/-/m)

      Prs IXa (m) -,-, *sompastar-ñ, sompastär;-,-, sompäskentär* (MQ)

           Imp —

           nt-Part —

           m-Part —

           Ger I — Abstr I —

      Sub V — Opt —

           Ger II *sāmpalle* Abstr II — Priv —

           Inf *sāmpatsi*

Pt I (m) -,-, *sampāte*;-,-, *sampāṃte-ñ*

PPt *sassāmpaṣ*

Ipv I (m) *psāmpar;-*

The 3.sg.mid. Prs *sompastra* is also attested in THT 1160 a 4 and THT 1216 b 1, the 3.pl.mid. Prs *sompäskentär* in St. 42.2.3 a 1 (a text with MQ character), the Ger II *sāmpal(l)e* in IOL Toch 603 a 4 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.), the 3.pl. Pt *sampāṃte-ñ* in PK AS 18A b 4 (Thomas, 1979a, 240), and the obl. PPt *sassāmpaṣ* in PK Cp 37, 44 and PK AS 7K a 4 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c., also cited by Couvreur, 1954, 89 without ref.). The restoration of *sampā ////* in 496, 7 to a middle form 3.sg. *sampā(te)* is not only recommended by the meter (cf. TochSprR(B), fn. s.v.), but also by the fact that the root is otherwise medium tantum. Beside the MQ form *samp(a)tsi*, and the newly attested Ger II *sāmpalle*, the Inf *sāmpatsi* is now also attested in the small fragment THT 1293 frg. 1 a 2 (*śaul sāmpatsi* "to take away the life"), and in IOL Toch 214 a 5 and IOL Toch 477 b 1 (for which see Peyrot, 2007, s.v.), so that the subjunctive stem has persistent initial accent.

~ *ᴬsumᵃ-* 'wegnehmen', 'take away, deprive of' (tr) (m+/-/-)

Prs VI (m+) -, *sumnātār*, *sumnātär*;-,-, *sumnāntär* Imp —

nt-Part *sumnānt*

m-Part —

Ger I — Abstr I —

Inf —

Sub V — Opt —

Ger II — Abstr II *sumāl̂une*

Pt —

PPt —

Ipv I (m) *psumār;* —

Instead of a 3.sg.mid. Prs TA *sumnāträ*, one has to restore to a 3.pl. Prs TA *sumnā<n>trä* in A 355 b 1; see TG, 479.

Eтүм. Evidently we have to set up a pre-PT paradigm present *somPä- vs. preterit *somPā/ō- (Tocharian A having generalized as root vowel what was the outcome of pre-PT *-o- by sound law in the original athematic root present). The etymology of *somPä- is not clear to me; in case one is willing to accept a metathesis pre-PT *nos-bʰi > *son-bʰi, one could equate *somPä- with Gk. νόσφι 'aloof, apart, away from'.

sār?- 'pflanzen', 'plant' (tr) (-/-/m)

Prs — Imp —

nt-Part —

m-Part —

Ger I — Abstr I —

Sub — Opt —

Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

Inf —

Pt I/VII (m) -,-, *saryate* (MQ); —

PPt —

       Ipv —

= *A*sār*?*- 'pflanzen, säen, kultivieren', 'plant, sow, cultivate' (tr) (-/-/x)

       Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt I/VII (x) -,-, *sāryā*; — | -,-, *sāryāt*;-,-, *sāryānt*
       PPt *sāsäryu* | in *sāsräyuräṣ* (sic)
       Ipv —

TA *sāryāt* in A 18 b 6 is analyzed by the manuals as a possible imperfect or preterit form from this root. Thomas, 1957, 78 takes this main clause verb for an imperfect, but the sentences quoted in Thomas 1957, 79f. that resemble the sentence containing TA *sāryāt* all have a preterit as main clause form, so I analyze the form as a preterit. A 3.pl.mid. TA *(sā)ryānt* is restored by Sieg, Übers. II, 32, fn. 13 in A 320 b 8; the 3.sg.act. TA *sāryā* (sic) is now attested in YQ 21 b 7. Finally, it is possible, but far from certain, that TA *sāryäṣlune* attested in the small fragment THT 1378 frg. a b 7 without context belongs here as well. Beside the Abs TA *sāsräyuräṣ* (sic) in A 372 a 3, there is a form TA *sātsräryoṣ* (sic) in A 355 b 2 that is emended to expected TA †*sāsäryuräṣ* by Sieg/Siegling, s.v. fn. 9.

SEM. According to Adams, DoT, 683, the basic meaning is 'plant', not 'seed, sow'; differently Schmidt, 1999b, 284. TA *kappās sār-* in YQ 21 b 7 is matched by Old Turkish *käbäs tarï-* 'cultivate cotton'; see Pinault, 2001, 132. ETYM. It is impossible for me to decide on the evidence currently available whether we have to do with a Pt VII or rather with a Pt I, since the TB Pt is only attested by a form from a document with MQ character, and since for Tocharian A one has to reckon with analogical influence from the imperfect kind of inflection anyway, witness the 3.sg.act. TA *sāryā* (except if one would want to claim that in Tocharian A, PT *-Cäyā(-) was bound to turn precisely into (*)-Cyā̃(-) with bimoric -ā̃(-) by sound change). To judge from the old *-men- abstracts TB/TA *sārm* 'seed' and TA *säryām* 'sowing', there once existed at least two different respective subjunctive < present stems, PT *sārä- and PT *säryā-, the latter of which may have started out as an aorist stem of a denominative to a noun pre-PT *sr̥-i̯ā- or even a pre-PT *sr-ii̯o-, the PT outcome of which may have finally turned into *sāryā- by analogical influence from the subjunctive stem PT *sārä- (cf. Adams, DoT, 683, who suggested "we may have here a denominative from *serye"). On the other hand, one could also set up a present stem pre-PT *sōr-(e)i̯e/o- (cf. Klingenschmitt, 1978, 1ff. = 2005, 159ff.) that could have served as a basis for a Pt VII. Probably from the root set up as *√ser 'aneinanderreihen, verknüpfen' by ²LIV, 534f. and as *√serH 'aneinanderreihen' by Hackstein, 2002, 4 with fn. 13 (see also Adams, l.c.). For attempts to derive the Tocharian forms rather from PIE *√seh₁ 'sow', see Rasmussen, 1989, 28, fn. 10; Kim, 2007a, 51; and again Adams, l.c., but not any

of them could satisfactorily account for the two subjunctive stems PT *sārä-
and PT *säryā-.

sāry- 'sow' → *sār?-* 'plant'

^A**säk^ä-** '± folgen', '± follow' (?) (-/a/m)

      Prs VI — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *säknāmāṃ*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub V (a) -,-, *skāṣ*;— Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt I (m) —;-,-, *skānt*
      PPt —
      Ipv —

SEM. The meaning 'folgen' proposed in TG, 477 is not certain (as pointed out by Schmidt, 1974, 290), but at least plausible in A 111 a 4: *tkaṃ rāp skānt yṣanaṃ* "he dug the ground, and they followed into the trench".

[^A**säṅk-** '?', according to TG, 477, a present form TA *säṅkeñcäṃ* from such a root may be attested in A 98 a 1, but both the passage and the word separation are unclear (see also s.v. ^A*rutk^ä-* '(re)move'). In the second passage A 94 a 4, we rather have to read a 3.sg. Prs TA *wnisäṅkāṣ-ñi* from ^A*wnisk^ä-* '± crush, torment'; see Couvreur, 1956, 86.]

^A**sät^ä?-** '?' (?) (-/-/m)

      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt I (m) -,-, *stāt*;—
      PPt —
      Ipv —

Unclear hapax in A 222 b 6: //// *tām praṣtaṃ stāt nuṃ kossi pättāṃñkät* • "at this time he again ... to kill the Buddha". One may think of a meaning like '± decide on' etc., cf. the parallel construction in the same line: *pkät nuṃ kossi ṣñi mācär* (sic) "again he intended to kill his own mother".

sätk^ä- 'sich ausbreiten', 'spread out' (itr) (m/-/a)

      Prs III (m) —;-,-, *sätkentär-ne* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *sätkemane*

                         Ger I — Abstr I —
           Sub V — Opt —
                          Ger II — Abstr II in *sätkālñecci* Priv —
                          Inf —
           Pt I (a) —;-,-, *sätkāre*
           PPt *sätkau*
           Ipv —
The *m*-Part *[sä]tkema[n]e* is attested in PK NS 699 a 3 (Couvreur, 1964, 248).
ANTIGRUNDVERB + KAUSATIVUM II 'verbreiten', 'spread' (tr) (a/-/m)
           Prs IXb (a) — Imp —;-,-, *sätkäṣṣiyeṃ-ne* (MQ)
                          nt-Part —
                          m-Part —
                          Ger I — Abstr I —
           Sub — Opt —
                          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                          Inf —
           Pt III (m) *sätkasamai* (sic),-,-; —
           PPt —
           Ipv —
The 3.pl. Imp *sätkä(ṣṣiyeṃ)-ne* is restored by G.-J. Pinault, p.c., in the
unpublished MQ text PK AS 12K a 1 (the form is parallel to the 3.pl. Imp
räṣṣiy[e](ṃ) 'they pulled out'), and is most likely a form of Prs IXb.
= *Asätk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sich ausbreiten', 'spread out' (itr) (m/-/a)
           Prs III (m) -,-, *sätkatär*;-,-, *sätkantär* Imp —
                          nt-Part —
                          m-Part —
                          Ger I — Abstr I —
                          Inf —
           Sub V — Opt —
                          Ger II — Abstr II *sätkālune*
           Pt I (a) -,-, *stäk/sätkā-ṃ*;-,-, *satkar*
           PPt *sätko*
           Ipv —
On the 3.pl.act. Pt TA *satkar* in imperfect function in A 312 a 3, see chap. Imp
15.3.1.
KAUSATIVUM I 'verbreiten', 'spread' (tr) (a/-/a)
           Prs VIII (a) -,-, *sätkäṣ*;-,-, *sätkseñc* Imp —
                          nt-Part —
                          m-Part —
                          Ger I — Abstr I —
                          Inf —
           Sub — Opt —
                          Ger II — Abstr II —
           Pt II (a) —;-,-, *sasätkār*
           PPt —
           Ipv —

ETYM. Maybe to be derived from PIE *sut-sk̂e/o- from the root *√seu̯t
(*√h₂seu̯t 'aufwallen', as per ²LIV, 285); see Pinault, 1988, 154, fn. 17, and
Adams, DoT, 684. For an alternative etymology (which would require pre-PT
*siC- > PT *säC-), see Melchert, 1978, 121.

[*Asäm-*, instead of TA *sämse(–)* as read by TochSprR(A) and TG, 477 in A 13 b
     5, Sieg, Übers. I, 17, fn. 4 rather emends to and restores TA *nämse(ñc)*
     'they bow', cf. TG, 446.]

särk⁽ᵃ⁾- '± sich kümmern um; ziehen (?)', '± take care of; pull (?)' (tr) (a/a/-)
        Prs VII (a) -,-, *srankäṃ;-,-, sräñken-ne* Imp —;-,-, *srañciyeṃ*
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V (a) — Opt -,-, *sarkoy;* —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
        Pt I in
        PPt *särkau*
        Ipv —
The 3.sg. Prs *srankäṃ* is attested in PK AS 7M a 2, the 3.pl. Prs *sräñken-ne* in
PK AS 6E a 1 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), and
the 3.sg. Sub *sarkoy* in the Old Turkish–Tocharian bilingual U 5208 = Toch
923 a 5, according to Schmidt, 2008a, 330. The expected PPt *särkau* can most
probably be found in the small fragment THT 1170 frg. e b 3 (MQ character;
cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.): //// *(ṣa)rmtsa • s̩arkau tā wa etre* //// "because of ... .
But having taken care of her, the hero ...".
KAUSATIVUM IV '± dazu zu bringen, sich zu sorgen', '± let take care of' (tr) (—)
        Prs IXb — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I *sarkäṣṣälle* Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
        Pt —
        PP —
        Ipv —
The Ger I *sarkäṣṣälle* is to be read in K 11 (= PK AS 7N) a 4, according to G.-J.
Pinault, p.c.
= *Asärk̂-* '± sich kümmern um', '± take care of' (?) (a/-/-)
        Prs VII (a) -, *sräñkāt, sräñkāṣ;* — Imp —
            nt-Part *sräñkāntās*
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —

Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

SEM. Different proposals for the meaning of this root have been offered so far. Since the TB Imp in 107 a 1 clearly refers to the preparation of 'porridge' (on which see most recently Pinault, 2008, 116ff. and Schmidt, 2008a, 329f.) and the TA forms to some emotional uproar, the manuals gave 'in Wallung bringen' as meaning of the root (following Sieg, Übers. II, 10; Übers. II, 35 'regst dich auf'; TEB II, 254; Couvreur, 1954b, 261 also proposed 'fährst du fort'). Unfortunately, the new attestation found in an Old Turkish bilingual rather complicates the question. According to Schmidt, 2008a, 330, *sarkoy* in U 5208 (cf. the photograph at DTA) is the equivalent of Old Turkish *tartsar* 'wenn er zieht'; he then further proposes to set up the meaning of the root as "ziehen; sich kümmern um, (Speisen) zubereiten". Similarly, Pinault, 2008, 117f. (without yet referring to the new attestation) sets up 'take care of, be deeply concerned with', a meaning that would also fit all the attestations from unpublished Paris texts: PK AS 7M a 2 (completed by PK NS 122a, PK NS 261, PK NS 262): *cmelaśc alloṅkna sraṅkäṃ proskai ktsaitsñe(sa)* "he is concerned with the fear about old age"; 3.pl. Prs *sräṅken-ne* in PK AS 6E a 1 is less clear: *sārmäśke wi sräṅken-ne •*; K 11 (= PK AS 7N) a 3f.: *śak pärkawänta pyapyai ailyñentse tuk-yakne sarkaṣṣalle* "one (he) should take great care in this way of the ten advantages of giving flower(s)". For TA *sräṅkāt* in A 343 a 2 Pinault, l.c., proposes the translation 'tu te préoccupes'. ETYM. Winter, 1980b, 555 = 1984, 248 = 2005, 242 analyzed this root as grundverb of *ṣärk-* 'surpass', but this is not too convincing for morphological and semantic reasons. If the basic meaning of the root is indeed 'take care of', one will want to derive it from the zero grade of PIE *√su̯ergʰ 'krank sein; sich sorgen' (²LIV, 613f., without Toch.), according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; cf. also the connection by Schmidt, 2008a, 330 with Ved. *sūrkṣata* (among others).

särp²- '± pochen, schlagen', '± beat (of the heart)' (itr) (-/-/a)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I/III (a) —;-,-, *särpar* (MQ)
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Hapax in the MQ text 119 a 4: *aräñci särpar ka* "the hearts have beaten". WTG, 298 analyzes the form as Pt I (with loss of -e before a clitic), while Peyrot, 2008, 135 prefers a Pt III (if the form is a verbal form at all). The apparent zero grade

does not a priori exclude a Pt III, because such Pt III forms are occasionally indeed found; see chap. Pt III 9.1.4.

säl⁽ᵃ⁾- '(auf)fliegen', 'fly, arise' (itr) (-/-/m)

      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt I (m) -,-, *salāte-ne*; —
      PPt *sasālau* | *sasāllaṣ*
      Ipv —

The nom. PPt *sasālau* is attested in H add.149 83 a 2 (now = IOL Toch 205; not in Broomhead; cf. now Peyrot, 2007, s.v.), cf. Hilmarsson, 1990, 93.

Antigrundverb '(herab)stürzen, (herab)werfen', 'throw (down)' (tr) (-/-/x)

      Prs — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub II — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf *ṣällatsi*
      Pt I (x) -, *ṣalāsta*, *ṣälla*;-,-, *ṣallāre*/*ṣalāre* | -, *ṣalātai*, *ṣallāte*; —
      PPt *(se)salyu* (MQ)/ *sälyu*
      Ipv —

The 2.sg. Pt *ṣalāsta* is attested in the graffito Qu 34; see Pinault, 1994a, 174; 2000a, 157. The PPt *(se)salyu* with non-palatalized root initial found in 338 a 1 belongs to this antigrundverb paradigm. There even seems to be another PPt variant *sälyu* in IOL Toch 879 b 3 (I owe the form to D. Q. Adams, p.c.), which is best taken as a *ltu*-type PPt built to the stem *sälyä/æ-; but note the absence of syncope and also the fact that in 338 a 1 the PPt form that I give as *(se)salyu* should not be read as a form without reduplication and taken as another rendering of that *sälyu*, because in documents with typical MQ features such as 338 an /ä/ not carrying the accent is rendered by ⟨ä⟩ and not by ⟨a⟩.

Kausativum II '(herab)stürzen, (herab)werfen', 'throw (down)' (tr) (a/-/-)

      Prs IXb (a) -,-, *ṣaläṣṣäṃ*;-,-, *ṣaläskeṃ* Imp —
            nt-Part *ṣaläṣṣeñcai*
            m-Part *ṣaläskemane*
            Ger I *ṣaläṣle* Abstr I —
      Sub IXb — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II *ṣaläṣṣälñe* Priv —
            Inf *ṣalässi*
      Pt II in
      PPt in *ṣeṣlorsa*

Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs forms *[ṣalä]ṣ[ṣ]ä(ṃ)* and *(ṣa)[lä]ṣṣä(ṃ)* are attested in graffiti from Qizil (Schmidt, 2001b, 74 and 76 ad painting no. 21 and no. 12). The 3.pl. Prs *ṣaläskeṃ* is found in the small fragment THT 1622 frg. c b 3, the Abstr *ṣalaṣṣalñe* probably in IOL Toch 998 b 3 (apparently a Pratīyasamutpāda text):
• *āntseṃ ṣalaṣṣalñe ṣotrī (·)e ////* "throwing the elements [is ?] the mark ..." (Tamai, 2007, s.v., wrongly reads *y(·)laṣṣalñe*). The Inf *ṣalässi* is also attested in SI B Toch./13, 1 (Pinault, 1998, 6ff.).

= ᴬ*säl(ä)-* '(auf)fliegen', 'fly, arise' (itr) (a+/-/-)

        Prs I (a+) —;-,-, *sliñc* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *sälmāṃ*
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I in
        PPt *sāsluṃt*
        Ipv —

Antigrundverb/Kausativum I 'werfen', 'throw' (tr) (—)

        Prs VIII — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *släsmāṃ*
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Sem./Etym. For the semantics and the averbo (but not for the further analysis) I follow in general the detailed treatment by Hilmarsson, 1990, 87ff. Certainly a cognate of Lat. *salīre* 'jump, leap', etc.; for the details of the diachronic morphology, see Malzahn, in print a.

*sälk*ᵃ- 'herausziehen; vorführen, zeigen', 'pull; show' (tr) (m/x/m)

        Prs VII (m) -,-, *slaṅktär*;-,-, *slaṅkentär* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *slaṅkälle* Abstr I —
        Sub V (x) -,-, *sālkaṃ*;— | *salkamar*,-,-;-,-, *sälkāntär* (MQ)
                Opt -,-, *salkoy-ne*;— |
                -,-, *sälkoytär* (MQ);—
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *salkatsi*
        Pt I (m) *sälkāmai*, *sälkatai* (MQ), *sälkāte*;-,-, *sälkānte*

PPt *sälkoṣäṃts*

Ipv —

The 3.pl.mid. Prs *slaṅkentär* is attested in PK NS 34 b 2 (Pinault, 1988a, 188), the 3.pl.mid. Sub *sälkānträ* in the MQ text THT 1254 a 2 (differently Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). In PK AS 13I b 4 the expected Inf *salkatsi* and not †*salkatsā* is to be read (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c., contra Thomas, 1954, 756), and this Inf is now also attested in THT 1323 frg. 1 a 4: //// *kauc*ꞈ *salkatsi*. Since we apparently have to do with an ablauting subjunctive with persistent initial accent, one has to restore to a 3.sg. Opt *(sa)lkoy-ne* instead of *(sä)lkoy-ne* in 154 b 1 (pace TochSprR(B); WTG, 298). In TA, the restoration TA *sä(lko)* //// in A 427 a 2 is assured by the Sanskrit equivalent Skt. *hṛta-* 'pulled out' (see Couvreur, 1966, 169). SEM. The concrete meaning 'pull out' is, e.g., attested in PK NS 107 a 5: *(wit)s(a)kai sälkorme(ṃ)* = Skt. *mūlam uddhṛtya* "after the root had been pulled out"; the figurative meaning 'show, present' is, e.g., attested in 5 b 2f. The function of the middle is unclear (despite Schmidt, 1974, 439, 469, 487, 300). ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√selk 'ziehen' (²LIV, 530); see Adams, DoT, 689.

*sälp*ᴮ⁷- 'glühen', 'glow' (itr) (a+/-/a)

      Prs I + II (a+) -,-, *salpäṃ;-,-, salpeṃ* Imp -,-, *sälpī-ne*; —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part *sälpamane*

          Ger I — Abstr I —

      Sub V (?) — Opt —

          Ger II *sälpallentse* (Š, sic) Abstr II — Priv —

          Inf *sälpatsi* (sic)

      Pt I (a) -,-, *salpa*; —

      PPt *sälpowsai* (Š)

      Ipv —

Since the plural *salpeṃ* in 406 a 6 refers to the singular subject *käṃtwo* 'tongue', TochSprR(B), s.v., fn. 8 consequently emends it to a 3.sg. *salpäṃ*, cf. also Schmidt, 1986, 426; an assured instance of the 3.pl. Prs *salpeṃ* is now found in PK AS 17D a 2 (Pinault, 1994, 128), so we have to do with a basically athematic present stem that has introduced a thematic 3.pl. ending (cf. chap. Prs I 24.1.2.). The class of the subjunctive stem is not so clear. One would expect Sub V judged by TA and the TB preterit forms, but then all the forms attested so far from the Sub stem would have to show misspellings. Accordingly, Adams, DoT, 689f. analyzes the Sub as Class I. As for the Inf, Broomhead I, 114 renders the form in question in H. 149.add 134 b 6 as damaged *säl[pa](ts)i*, and a reading *[ā]* is indeed not likely, because some trace of the *ā*-vowel should still be visible on the manuscript (cf. Peyrot, 2007, s.v. IOL Toch 178); *sälpallentse* 'of the fever' in 497 a 8 (Š) may show a defective writing such as *śtwara* does in line a 6, so that a misspelling (or careless copying from an MQ text) cannot be totally excluded. The *mo*-adjective *sälpamo* 'glowing' is not diagnostic, because *mo*-adjectives are generally based on the present stem (see chap. Sub VII 22.2.3.1., fn. 5). Finally,

there may be a 1.sg.mid. Opt *s̱alpoymar* attested in the small fragment THT 2372 frg. d b 2 that would certainly attest to a Sub V, but the form is without further context. The 3.sg. Pt *salpa* is also attested in THT 1445 b 4.

= ᴬ*sälp*ᵃ- 'glühen', 'glow' (itr) (a/a/-)

        Prs I (a) *sälpäm,-,-; sälpmäs,-, sälpiñc* Imp —;-,-, *sälypār*

                nt-Part —

                m-Part *sälpmāṃ*

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf *sälptsi*

        Sub V (a) — Opt -,-, *sälpiṣ;—*

                Ger II *sälpālyi* Abstr II —

        Pt I in

        PPt *sälpont*

        Ipv —

TA *sälpäm* in A 92 a 3 is certain; see TochSprR(A), "Verbesserungen und Nachträge", 252 ad p. 53.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'zum Glühen bringen', 'make glow' (tr) (—)

        Prs — Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf —

        Sub IX — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II *sälpāṣlune*

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

Eᴛʏᴍ. Cf. Pinault, 2001a, 252 and Hackstein, 2003b, 83 for setting up pre-PT *sulp-.

si- 'drain' → *ṣi-* 'id.'

*sik*ᵃ- 'treten, schreiten', 'step, set foot' (itr) (a/a/-)

        Prs VI (a) -,-, *siknaṃ;—* Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub V (a) -,-, *saikaṃ;—* Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from PIE *√sei̯k 'erreichen' (²LIV, 522); see Adams, DoT, 691.

^A**sik^(ä)-** 'überschwemmt werden', 'be overflown' (itr) (m/a/-)

      Prs III (m) —;-,-, *sikaṃtär* Imp —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part —

          Ger I — Abstr I —

          Inf —

      Sub V (a) -,-, *sekaṣ*;— Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II —

      Pt I in

      PPt *siko*

      Ipv —

ANTIGRUNDVERB/KAUSATIVUM I 'überschwemmen', 'overflow' (tr) (—)

      Prs — Imp —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part —

          Ger I — Abstr I —

          Inf —

      Sub — Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II —

      Pt II/III in

      PPt *sasiku*

      Ipv —

SEM. Since the present stem is of Class III, the grundverb should be intransitive. The verb refers to 'water' (A 14 a 2; A 152 a 4), the active 3.sg. Sub TA *sekaṣ-äm* in A 72 a 2 is used metaphorically: *sne plā wlamträ was tāloṣ sekaṣ-äm śwā(l)* "... wenn wir Elenden ohne Ausnahme (?) sterben, dann wird euch Fleisch im Überfluß sein (und es wird schlecht werden)", as per Peyrot, in print. ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√seiku̯ 'ausgießen' (²LIV, 523).

si-n- med. 'sich sättigen an', 'bedrückt sein', mid. 'satiate oneself', 'be

      depressed' (itr) (m/-/m)

      Prs Xa (m) -, *sinastar*,-;— Imp —

          nt-Part —

          m-Part —

          Ger I — Abstr I —

      Sub I — Opt —

          Ger II — Abstr II *silñe* Priv —

          Inf —

      Pt III (m) -,-, *sintsate*;—

      PPt *sesīnu* | *sesinoṣ*

      Ipv —

The Abstr *silñe* has the meaning 'depression'. The nom.sg. PPt *sesīnu* is attested in THT 1339 a 5 and in IOL Toch 308 b 2 (Peyrot, 2008a, 105).

KAUSATIVUM I act. 'sättigen', 'satiate', mid. 'bedrückt werden', 'get depressed'

      (tr) (x/-/-)

      Prs Xb (x) -,-, *sīnäṣṣäṃ*;— | —;-,-, *sināskentär* (MQ) Imp —

nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —
   Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
   Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

According to Hackstein, 1995, 297, the 3.sg. Prs *sīnäṣṣäṃ* has the meaning 'sättigt, läßt satt werden'; the 3.pl.mid. Prs *sinäskentär* 'bedrückt sein' cited by TEB I, 215, § 386 without ref. can now found in THT 1191 b 5 (MQ character): //// *k(·) kly(au)seṃ añm̲atse sin̲askentr̲a l̲aklesa* "... they listen[, and] become depressed because of suffering".

= *ᴬsi-n-* act. 'sättigen', 'satiate', mid. 'sich sättigen an', 'bedrückt sein', 'satiate oneself', 'be depressed' (tr/itr) (x/m/m)

Prs X (x) -, *sinäṣt,-;-,-, siṃseñc* | -, *sinäṣtār, sinäṣtär;-,-, siṃsantär*

   Imp —
   nt-Part —
   m-Part —
   Ger I *siṃṣäl* Abstr I —
   Inf —

Sub VII (m) —;-,-, *siñantär* Opt — Priv *asinät*

   Ger II *siñäl* Abstr II *siñlune*

Pt III (m) -, *siṃsāte,-;* —
PPt —
Ipv —

According to Sieg, Übers. I, 30, a 2.sg.mid. TA *si(näṣtār)* is to be restored in A 25 b 5. The PPt TA *sasyu* rather belongs to *ᴬsay-* 'satiate'; see s.v. *ᴬsay-*. TG, 478 furthermore proposes that TA *mā sasiṃ •* in A 209 b 5 may contain a 3.sg. Pt II of this root.

Sᴇᴍ. According to Hackstein, 1995, 295, we are not facing two homonymous roots *si-n-* 'satiate' and *si-n-* 'be depressed', but with one single root that has the basic meaning 'satiate', the meaning 'be depressed' being due to a special semantic development of the middle: 'sich ersättigen an' → 'ermatten, müde/bedrückt werden'. Contrary to the manuals, Hackstein, 1995, 297f. shows that the meaning 'sich sättigen' is also to be found in TB. Eᴛʏᴍ. According to Hackstein, 1995, 299f., the root is not to be connected with Ved. *sināti* 'binds', etc. (as proposed by Hollifield, 1978, 173ff.; see also the discussions by Adams, 1979, 297ff. and Hilmarsson, 1991c, 86f.), but rather with PIE *√seh₂(i̯) 'satt werden' (²LIV, 520f.). The basic Toch. stem is an athematic nasal present (→ subjunctive) *säynä- from *sinu-; see chap. Sub VII 22.2.2.; *sinu- obviously replaced an even more archaic *si-n-h₂-. See also s.v. *soy-/ᴬsay-* 'satiate'.

^A**sip^ä-** 'salben', 'anoint' (tr) (m/-/-)

> Prs I/II (m) -,-, *siptär*; — Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
>> Inf *siptsi*
> Sub V — Opt —
>> Ger II *sepal* Abstr II —
> Pt I in
> PPt *sāsepu*
> Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. TA *siptär* (TG, 478 "Frgm.") is attested in the small fragment THT 2509 a 2 without context.

Eᴛʏᴍ. Probably to be derived from PIE *√sei̯b 'fließen lassen' (²LIV, 521).

siy^ä- 'schwitzen', 'sweat' (itr) (m/-/-)

> Prs III (m) -,-, *syetär*; — Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
> Sub V — Opt —
>> Ger II *syälle* Abstr II *syälñe* Priv —
>> Inf —
> Pt I in
> PPt *siyau*
> Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. Prs *syeträ* is attested in 236 frg. 1 b 3 (now = THT 1478); see Schmidt, 1974, 93f. with fn. 5 following an assumption by Winter, 1962a, 31 = 1984, 273 = 2005, 61, who was more reluctant to accept his own proposal than Schmidt; the PPt *siyausai* attested in 324 b 1 without context also belongs to this root, as per Schmidt, l.c.

Eᴛʏᴍ. In the manuals the root is set up as *syā-*, but the underlying structure must be PT *säyā-. To be derived from PIE *√su̯ei̯d 'in Schweiß ausbrechen' (²LIV, 607); see Ringe, 1987, 117; possibly a denominative from a noun *su̯id-i̯eh₂-.

^{AB}**su-** 'rain' → *suw^ä-/ ^Asuw^(ä)-* 'id.'

^A**su[?]-** 'nähen', 'sew' (?) (—)

> Prs I — Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I *sul* Abstr I —
>> Inf —
> Sub — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II —

Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

TA *sul* is attested as gloss in the Sanskrit text SHT 5, 1033; for its meaning, see Schmidt, 1994b, 269f. It is conceivable that this root in contrast to ^A^*suw*^(a)^- 'rain' did not have A-character, but note that ^A^*suw*^(a)^- 'rain' also formed a present of Class I.

suk^ʔ^**-** 'herabhängen; zögern', 'hang down; hesitate' (itr) (-/m/-)

Prs — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub XII (m) — Opt -,-, *sukaññitär*;-,-, *sukaññiyentär*
    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
    Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. Opt *sukaññitär* is attested in the small fragment THT 1235 b 2, optative (and not imperfect) is certain; see below.

Kausativum I 'verweilen/zögern lassen', 'let linger/hesitate' (tr) (a/-/-)

Prs IXb (a) —;-,-, *ṣūkäskeṃ* Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
    Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

Sem./Etym. The 3.pl.mid. Opt *sukaññiyentär* in 530 b 2 translates preceding Skt. *abhipralambeyu* (sic) 'they may let dangle'. The Kaus. I 3.pl. Prs IXb *ṣūkäskeṃ* is construed with the adverb *waiptāyar* in 44 b 3: *ceu̯ (mā) tn(e) ṣūkäskeṃ waiptāyar* "Die Vorstellungen lassen ihn hier nicht zögern", as translated by TochSprR(B), transl., on account of Skt. *vi √lambh* (cf. also ^2^TochSprR(B), 214). Differently, WTG, 300 and TEB II, 256 gloss the root with 'herabhängen, verweilen'. The new attestation in THT 1235 b 2 rather speaks in favor of a meaning 'hesitate': *wentsi p̠akno(y)[t̠a]r no sukaññit̠ra* //// "but if (s)he intends to speak [and] hesitates ..." (reading pace Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). WTG and TEB, l.c., also analyze *suknaṃ* in H 149.44 b 2 as a form of this root, but this rather belongs to *suk*^a^- '± bring'; see s.v. *suk*^a^-. Hilmarsson, 1991a, 78ff., and Adams, DoT, 694 want to set up one single root *suk-* 'hand over, deliver', 'dangle'. Although this cannot be excluded, I rather separate the roots, because the semantics are not very close, and both may differ with

respect to A-character (to be sure, this root also may basically have A-character, because deverbative Class XII forms regularly lose A-character; see chap. Prs/Sub XII).

suk^{ß}- '± (über)bringen', '± bring' (tr) (a+/-/-)
  Prs VI (a+) -,-, *suknaṃ;-,-, suknaṃ* Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part *suknāmane*
    Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
    Inf —
  Pt —
  PPt —
  Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *suknaṃ* is attested in PK AS 15C b 4: *yaśodharañ suknaṃ* "he brings (the jewelry) to Yasodharā" (Pinault, 1989a, 189), the *m*-Part *suknāmane* in PK AS 17C b 2 (Thomas, 1979, 164). The 3.pl. *suknaṃ* is found in H 149.44 b 2: *tumeṃ cwi pyapyaiṃ suknaṃ uppāl* "then they bring him lotus flowers" (cf. Broomhead I, 193, who analyzed the form as belonging to *suk$^?$-* 'dangle', but the meaning 'bring' makes more sense).

= ^{A}*suk^{ß}-* '± (über)bringen', '± bring' (tr) (—)
  Prs VI — Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part *suknāmāṃ*
    Ger I — Abstr I —
    Inf —
  Sub — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II —
  Pt I in
  PPt in *sukoräṣ*
  Ipv —

SEM./ETYM. Hilmarsson, 1991a, 78ff., followed by Adams, DoT, 694, sets up one single verbal stem *suk-* 'hand over, deliver', 'dangle', whereas TEB II, 256 assigns the attested forms to two different roots *suk-*. According to Hilmarsson, 1991a, 80, the root "does not express the idea of 'handing something over' but rather that of 'holding something aloft toward someone'". Although this may be true, and since the combination of Prs XII and Prs VI is furthermore not uncommon, I rather follow TEB in distinguishing two different roots; note that *suk$^?$-* means 'dangle' and 'hesitate', and a semantic development 'dangle' → 'let hang aloft → 'deliver' is certainly not trivial. The two roots may not be homonymous either, because they may differ with respect to A-character.

*A*_s*ǔkaṣ-ⁱññ-* 'glücklich sein', 'be happy' (itr) (m/-/-)

       Prs XII (m) -,-, *sǔkaṣiñtär*;— Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

ETYM. Most likely a denominative, the basic noun of which is unattested. Unrelated TB *skw-ᵃññ-* 'be happy' is formed in a similar way.

sum- '± träufeln', '± trickle' (tr) (—)

       Prs IXb — Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I *sumäṣṣälle* Abstr I —
       Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
       Pt —
       PPt —
       Ipv —

The form is attested twice in medical texts, e.g., in Fill. W 13 a 6: *eśane sumäṣṣälle* "es ist in die Augen zu träufeln" (Sieg, 1955, 74).

*A*_{sum}*ᵃ-* 'take away' → *sāmp*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'id.'

suwᵃ-/ swās⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'regnen', 'rain' (itr) (a+/a/a)

       Prs V (a+) —;-,-, *suwaṃ* Imp -,-, *suwoy*;-,-, *swoyen/sawoṃ* (sic)
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *swāmane*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
       Sub V (a) -,-, *swāsaṃ*;— Opt -,-, *swāsoy*;—
            Ger II *swāsallye* Abstr II *swāsalñe* Priv —
            Inf —
       Pt I (a) -,-, *swāsa*;—
       PPt —
       Ipv —

The 3.sg. Opt *swāsoy* seems attested in THT 1550 b 5 (such a form is listed in TEB I, 228, § 412,1 without ref.), and the Abstr *swāsalñ(e)* in the small fragment THT 1539 frg. d a 3 (see Schmidt, 2006, 464).

KAUSATIVUM I 'regnen lassen', 'let rain' (tr) (a+/a/a)

       Prs IXb (a+) *swāsäskau,-,-;-,-,*, *swāsäskeṃ* Imp —

           nt-Part *swāsäṣṣeñca*

           m-Part *swāsäskemane*

           Ger I — Abstr I —

       Sub IXb (a) — Opt —;-,-, *swāṣye-ñ* (sic)

           Ger II — Abstr II in *swāsäṣṣälñeṣṣe* Priv —

           Inf *swāsässi*

       Pt IV (a) *swāsäṣṣawa*, *swāsäṣṣasta*, *swāsäṣṣa*; —

       PPt —

       Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs *swāsäskeṃ* is attested in PK NS 39 b 2; see Thomas, 1979, 177, fn. 148; the Imp or Opt *swāsäṣyeṃ* from an unpublished Berlin text he also mentions there (without ref.) can be found in THT 1687 frg. b b 3; the 3.sg. Pt *swāṣaṣ[ṣ]a* is also attested in THT 1927 b 6. The derived adj. *swāsäṣṣälñeṣṣe* is found in PK AS 17B b 2, the *m*-Part *swāsäskemane* in PK AS 15A a 2 (both unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). Pace the manuals, I analyze the Prs and Sub of the kausativum as stems of Class IXb instead of XI; see the discussion in chap. Prs XI.

= *ᴬsuw⁽ä⁾-/ᴬswās⁽ä⁾-* 'regnen', 'rain' (itr) (a+/-/a)

       Prs I (a+) —;-,-, *swiñc* Imp —;-,-, *svawrä/sawr-äm*

           nt-Part —

           m-Part *sūmāṃ*

           Ger I — Abstr I —

           Inf —

       Sub V — Opt —

           Ger II — Abstr II *swāslune*

       Pt I (a) —;-,-, *swāsar*

       PPt —

       Ipv —

TG, 478 lists TA *svawrä* in A 274 a 2 and TA *sawr-äm* in A 298 a 4 as uncertain imperfects from this root (cf. also TG, "Nachträge", 486), and this analysis makes indeed perfect sense in the respective passages: A 274 a 2 (= MSN XI, cf. Pinault, 1999, 199; the passage has no direct equivalent in the Old Turkish parallel version): *meyā tkaṃ svawrä wroki ciñcraṃ śla pyā(pyās)* "es bebte die Erde, es regneten Perlen zusammen mit lieblichen Blumen" (as translated by Schmidt, 1974, 121); A 298 a 4 (= MSN XXI, cf. Pinault, 1999, 203f.; there is no exact equivalent in the Old Turkish parallel version): //// *tkanā • sawr-äm sälpmāṃ yepeyntu kāre(ñ)* "... on the ground. Glowing knives [and] swords rained down on ...". On the imperfect formation, see chap. Imp 15.3.3.

KAUSATIVUM I 'regnen lassen', 'let rain' (tr) (a+/-/-)

       Prs VIII (a+) -,-, *swāsäṣ*; — Imp —

           nt-Part *swāṣṣantāṃ*

           m-Part *swāsäsmāṃ*

           Ger I — Abstr I —

                    Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                    Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Instead of a 2.sg. TA *swā[sä](ṣt)* (thus the reading and restoration in TEB II, 39, no. X, 10), one has to restore to TA *swā(rä)ṣt(ār)* in A 244 b 3, i.e., a form from ᴬ*swār⁽ᵃ⁾ˀ-* 'have pleasure in' on account of the Sanskrit parallel version, as per Schmidt, 1983, 128; 1987, 158f. In A 50 a 1 one can arguably restore TA *swāsä(ṣ)*: TA *omlaṃ ākrunt swāsä(ṣ)* "(s)he lets rain hot tears" (the restoration to an imperfect form is excluded). Pace the manuals, I analyze the Prs of the kausativum as Class VIII; see the discussion in chap. Prs XI (the geminated *-ṣṣ-* is most likely a reflex of the former *sk*-stem suffix).

Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from the root set up as PIE *√sh₂eu̯ 'regnen' by ²LIV, 545. On the formation of the TA Prs, see above all Pinault, 1994, 177f. and Klingenschmitt, 1994, 408 = 2005, 433, fn. 169. The *s*-extended stem variant *swās^ᵃ-* is, according to Adams, DoT, 693f., a denominative of *swese* 'rain' ("< *suh₃-os-o-"); according to Winter, 1965, 193 and 207 = 2005, 109, the noun is precisely a back-formation on the basis of the subjunctive stem *swāsā-*. On the *sā*-extension, see also the discussion in chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.6.2.3. and Peters, 2006, 336. Note that TA *swāslune*, TA *swāsar* clearly imply pre-TA < PT *swāsā-, whereas the TB Prs V seems to require pre-TB < PT *säwā-; quite possibly, PT *säwā- is to be presupposed on the evidence of the TA 3.pl. Imp *sawr-äm* as well. It is a rather obvious guess that PT *säwā- was originally banned from polysyllabic forms, and that the *-ä- of *säwā- had developed in what even earlier had been monosyllabic forms. There are different opinions on the origin of this *s(ä)wā-; see above all Pinault, 1994, 177; Hackstein, 1995, 18 on the one hand, and Lindeman, 1987, 301 on the other hand.

ᴬ**se-** 'support' → *sai-n-* 'id.'

sew- 'leiden (?)' → *wät^ᵃˀ-* 'fight'

sai-n- med. 'sich stützen auf, abhängen von', 'lean on, rely on' (itr) (m/m/m)
        Prs Xa (m) -,-, *sainastär*;-,-, *sainaskentär* (MQ) Imp -,-, *sainaṣṣītär*; —
                    nt-Part —
                    m-Part —
                    Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub I (m) —;-,-, *sainäntär* (MQ) Opt —
                    Ger II *saille* Abstr II — Priv —
                    Inf *saitsi/saintsi*
        Pt III (m) *saintsamai*,-,-; —
        PPt *sasainu* | *sasainoṣ*
        Ipv III (m) *psainar*;-

The 3.sg.mid. Prs *sainastär* is attested in KVāc 28 b 4 (Schmidt, 1986, 61); the 3.sg.mid. Imp *(sai)naṣṣītär* is, according to Thomas, 1972a, 230 and Schmidt, 1974, 16f., fn. 4, to be read and restored in FK 590 (= PK NS 40) a 4 (ed. by Van Windekens, 1940, tab. III; cf. also Couvreur, 1948, 327f.): //// *(sai)naṣṣīträ ṣpīkaisa ekaśriṅke rṣāke su* "the r̥ṣī Ekaśr̥ṅga leant on a crutch". Probably one can separate a 3.sg.mid. Sub *saintr̥a* in the small fragment THT 1599 frg. f a 3. The Inf variant *saintsi* is attested in an unpublished Paris text, according to Couvreur, 1954, 85; the Ger II *saille* is found in KVāc 22 a 3 (Schmidt, 1986, 55). The manuals cite the form of the 1.sg.mid. Pt in 515 b 4 as *sentsamai*, but the root vowel seems, in fact, to be damaged, so already TochSprR(B) proposed to read *s[ai]ntsamai* (the original manuscript seems lost). PPt *sasainoṣ* is attested in 195 b 4. Hilmarsson, 1991c, 72ff. interprets the PPt and the Ipv as formations of a kausativum and translates the passage 41 a 1 by "having made inhaling [and] exhaling lean toward (or: lean for) [the benefit of] body [and] soul", i.e., "having swayed inhaling [and] exhaling for [the benefit of] body [and] soul". The Prātimokṣa rule 322 a 1 *mā (ca)ṅke sasainu osne ṣmalle* Hilmarsson translates by "having pressed [his] stomach [against another monk] he is not to dwell in the house", comparing Skt. *aṃsāsaṃghaṭṭikā-* 'nudging the shoulders (when monks enter a house together)'. However, according to K. T. Schmidt, apud von Simson, 2000, 307, fn. 8 this passage rather refers to the Śaikṣa rule B 18: "wir wollen uns nicht mit in die Seiten gestemmten Armen in ein Haus setzen", i.e., "die Seite stützend" (the manuals translate *caṅke*/TA *cwaṅke* with 'Schoß', which may be fitting for A 314 a 7, but not, e.g., for W 14 b 2, where it refers to a region below the belly — not with Adams, DoT, 250 'breast'). The interpretation of 322 a 1 given by Schmidt is, in my opinion, now confirmed by the London parallel text IOL Toch 803 b [= a] 1: //// *[s](a)sainu osn(e)* ////; the next line b [= a] 2 certainly deals with Śaikṣ B 19 or B 20 (cf. Peyrot, 2007, s.v.). Hilmarsson, l.c., 72 also analyzes the Ipv *psain[a]* in the bilingual text 527 a 1 *psain[a] kl(·)* //// (= Skt. *avadhatsva śrotaṃ* "listen!") as a kausativum and restores *kl(autsai)* "(lit.) make the ear lean" = "pay attention". But according to Schmidt, 1974, 25, fn. 4, one can also read a middle form *psain[a](r)*, because the upper part of the akṣara in question is damaged. Since a reading of the regular active *s*-imperative †*psain* is excluded without emendation, I follow Schmidt's proposal.

~ *ᴬse-* '(unter)stützen', 'support' (tr) (m/m/-)

  Prs VIII (m) —;-,-, *sesantär* Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part *sesmāṃ*
    Ger I — Abstr I —
    Inf —
  Sub VII (m) *señmār*,-,-;— Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II —
  Pt III in
  PPt *sāseyu*
  Ipv III (m) *psesār*, *psesāc*

Sᴇᴍ. See the detailed discussion in Hilmarsson, 1991c, 67ff. The Ger II in KVāc 22 a 3 has a figurative sense "stützen, bewahren", as per Schmidt, 1986, 90 with fn. 7. The analysis of the valency is difficult. There is no certain attestation of transitive use in TB; though most finite TB forms are attested in fragmentary context and are hence unclear with respect to valency, at least *sainaskentär* in 125 a 2 seems to be construed with perlative: //// *(pelai?)knesa sainaskentär*; restoration according to W. Winter, p.c. Things are different in TA. Hilmarsson, l.c., analyzes the TA verb also as an intransitive one. It is true that most of the forms discussed by him are construed with the perlative or the allative, but all of them are non-finite forms (on the PPt, see also Carling, 2000, 176f.). On the other hand, there is now an apparently transitive finite form in YQ 28 b 3: *(mana)rkāñ bādhariṃ brāhmaṃ āmpārc sesanträ* "the disciples supported Badhari the Brahmin on both sides" (Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 36f.). Transitive is also the 2.sg. Ipv TA *(ps)esār* in A 359, 3 (restored with some certainty): *(ps)esār ymār sem tñi säm*, translating Skt. *upaniśrayāśu śaraṇaṃ*. Schmidt, 1974, 279, with fn. 5 translates "stütze dich schnell auf eine Stütze (Obl.) für dich", and Hilmarsson, l.c., 69 "rely immediately on a shelter for yourself"; Hilmarsson assumes that the transitive valency found with this form is simply owed to its status as imperative, because the imperative of basically intransitive verbs can show transitive valency (which is true, although this is attested very rarely; on that question, see chap. Valency 4.10.1.). The 1.sg.mid. Sub TA *señmār* in A 233 a 4 is without context; for the Ipv TA *psesāc-ñi* in YQ 28 b 1, see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 36f. Eᴛʏᴍ. Hilmarsson, 1991c, 83f., followed by Pinault, 2002a, 259, derives the root from PIE *√sh₂ei̯ 'fesseln, binden' (²LIV, 544, without Toch.); the PIE nasal present *si-n-h₂- clearly must have been replaced by *si-n-u- in pre-PT; cf. Adams, DoT, 700 and see chap. Sub VII 22.2.2.

soy- 'satt werden, gesättigt', 'become sated, satisfied' (itr) (a/a/a)

  Prs II (a) —;-, *soycer, soyeṃ* Imp —
    nt-Part —
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub II (a) — Opt -,-, *soyi*; —
    Ger II — Abstr II *soylñe* Priv *ontsoyätte/ontsoytte*
    Inf *soytsi*
  Pt I (a) —;-,-, *soyāre*
  PPt *sosoyu* | *sosoyoṣ*
  Ipv —
Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'sättigen, zufrieden stellen', 'satiate, satisfy' (tr) (a/-/a)
  Prs IXb (a) -, *soyast* (sic), *soyäṣṣäṃ*;-,-, *soyäskem-ne* (MQ)
    Imp —;-,-, *soyäṣyeṃ*
    nt-Part *soyäṣṣeñca*
    m-Part —
    Ger I — Abstr I —
  Sub IXb — Opt —

Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
Inf *soyässi/soyasi* (MQ)
Pt IV (a) *soyäṣṣāwa* (MQ), *soyṣasta, soyṣa;-,-, soyṣṣare* (MQ)
PPt —
Ipv —

The 2.sg. Prs *soyast* is attested in PK AS 17I + NS 77.1 a 5 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 3.sg. *soyäṣṣäṃ* also in THT 1324 frg. b a 5 (Garbhāvakrāntisūtra): //// *wī ka̲nte reṣṣaṃ soyäṣṣaṃ kektseñ po yke postaṃ 3(0)* (differently Tamai, 2007a, s.v.) "... 200 flows [and] satiates the body completely one after the other *30*.". The 3.pl. Imp *soyäṣyeṃ* can be found in THT 1179 frg. a b 5 (M. Peyrot, p.c.; differently Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). The 1.sg. Pt *soyäṣṣāwa* from IOL Toch 47 has MQ character (cf. Peyrot, 2008, 229).
= ᴬ*say-* 'sättigen, zufrieden stellen', 'satiate, satisfy' (tr) (-/-/?)

Prs — Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Inf —
Sub — Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt II (?) -,-, *sasyā-(ñi/t)*;—
PPt *sasyu*
Ipv —

According to Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 278, the 3.sg. Pt TA *sasyā* in YQ 41 a 4 is either to be restored to an active form TA *sasyā<-ñi>* or to a middle form TA *sasyā<t>*. They furthermore analyze it as a causative to ᴬ*si-* 'satiate', but, while this root is certainly a cognate, the claim by Winter, 1977, 156f. = 1984, 202 = 2005, 193f. that PPt TA *sasyu* < *sasayu is the direct equivalent of TB *sosoyu* is no doubt correct. We are dealing with a TA root ᴬ*say-* = TB *soy-* beside nasal-extended ᴬᴮ*si-n-* 'satiate'. The attestations of the PPt are certain; the question mark behind the form in TEB II, 155 simply indicates that such a form is restored by TEB II in text no. III, p. 49. ᴇᴛʏᴍ. The root-final -*y*- is no doubt owed to a resegmentation of pre-PT **sā-i̯e/o-* (< PIE **seh₂-i̯e/o-*) as **sāi̯-e/o-*; the root is PIE *√*seh₂(i̯)* 'satt werden' (²LIV, 520f.); see the discussion by Hackstein, 1995, 299f., and also s.v. *si-n-* 'satiate'.

saup- '?' (?)

Prs/Sub I/II — Opt —
Ger *saupälya* (MQ) Abstr — Priv —
Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

saupälya is read by Peyrot, 2007 in IOL Toch 80 (= H 149.291) a 2 (pace Broomhead I, 159): //// *(keklyauṣo)rne ślokänmā toṃ saupäl[ya] ñäś sm[i]lle*

[p]ākri yamäṣṣate te mäṃ(t weña) //// "having heard these ślokas, she *saupälya*, offered a smile to me [and] (spoke) thus:" (the text has archaic ductus and MQ character). Broomhead identified the manuscript as containing *Śakrapraśna*; its Sanskrit parallel was edited by Waldschmidt, 1932. In my opinion, the passage is parallel to the following passages of the two Chinese versions as given in German translation by Waldschmidt, l.c., 74 (the situation is that a Ghandarva tells the Buddha how he won the love of a girl by singing to her): "Großer Seher, als ich diese Strophen sang, da schaute sich jenes Mädchen um, freute sich, lachte unterdrückt und sprach zu mir:" (Madhyamāgama); "Als jenes Göttermädchen meine Strophen gehört hatte, schlug es die Augen auf, lachte und sprach zu mir:" (Dīrghāgama). Accordingly, *saup-* either refers to the girl turning round to or looking at the Ghandarva, or to some act of showing her delight.

skāy^ā- 'sich bemühen', 'strive, attempt' (itr) (a+/a/-)
      Prs VI (a+) -,-, *skainaṃ*;-,-, *skainaṃ* Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part *skaināmane*
           Ger I *skainälle* Abstr I —
      Sub V (a) *skāyau* (MQ),-, *skāyaṃ*;— Opt *skāyoym*,-, *skāyoy*;—
           Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
           Inf —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv I (a) *päskāya/skāya*; *päskāyas/skāyas*
TochSprR(B), glossary, 188 lists a preterit *skāya* without ref. that cannot be identified with certainty (*skāya* in the small fragment 1508 a 2 can as easily be an Ipv).
= *^A skāy^ā-* 'sich bemühen', 'strive, attempt' (itr) (a+/a/a)
      Prs VI (a+) -, *skenat*, *skenaṣ*;-,-, *skeneñc* Imp —
           nt-Part —
           m-Part *skenmāṃ*
           Ger I *skenal* Abstr I —
           Inf —
      Sub V (a) -,-, *skāyaṣ*;— Opt -,-, *skāwiṣ*;—
           Ger II — Abstr II *skāylune*
      Pt I (a) *skāyā*,-, *skāy*;—
      PPt —
      Ipv I (a) -; *päskāyäs*
The 3.sg. Sub TA *skā[y](aṣ)* is restored by Sieg, 1937, 134 in A 230 a 7. The 3.sg. Opt TA *skāwiṣ* in A 83 a 2 belongs here for morphological reasons; see Hilmarsson, 1994, 101ff. with fn. 5.
ETYM. According to Adams, DoT, 707, we are dealing with a denominative based on *skeye*/TA *ske* 'zeal, effort'.

^A skāw- '?' → *^A skāy^ā-* 'strive'

skāw^a- 'küssen', 'kiss' (tr) (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *skāwatsi*
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

Fairly certain hapax in 83, 3: *(e)ṅkormeṃ kenīne lamāstär-ne au(ṃ)tsate-ne rupaśke kantwas(a) skāwa(tsi)* "... ergriffen habend, setzt er ihn auf seine Knie [und] begann, [sein] Gesichtchen mit der Zunge zu küssen" (translation by Schmidt, 2001, 312). Pace Couvreur, 1954b, 261, the TA Opt form *skāwiṣ* in A 83 a 2 rather belongs to ^A*skāy^a-* 'strive'; see s.v. Etym. As per Adams, DoT, 706.

skär^a- 'beschimpfen; drohen', 'scold, reproach; threaten' (tr) (a+/a/x)

        Prs VI (a+) -,-, *skarraṃ*; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *skärrāmane*
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub V (a) -,-, *skaraṃ* (MQ); — Opt -,-, *skāroy*; —
                Ger II *skāralye* (MQ) Abstr II *skāralñe* (MQ) Priv —
                Inf *skāratsi*
        Pt I (x) —;-,-, *skarāre-ne* | —;-,-, *skārante* (MQ)
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 3.sg. Opt *skāroy* is arguably attested in 132 b 3, the Ger II *skāralye* in THT 1191 a 5, and the 3.pl. middle Pt in the same text in line b 7 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.; the text has MQ character). The subjunctive seems to have persistent initial accent.

^A***ske-*** 'strive' → ^A*skāy^a-* 'id.'

skai- 'strive' → *skāy^a-* 'id.'

sklok-^añ- 'verzweifelt sein', 'despair' (itr) (m/-/-)

        Prs XII (m) -,-, *sklokäntär* (MQ); — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —

            PPt —
            Ipv —
According to Couvreur, 1954, 83, the 3.sg.mid. Prs *sk[l]okäntär* is to be read in
the unpublished Paris MQ text PK AS 12J a 5 (confirmed by G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).
Etym. A denominative based on *sklok* 'doubt'; see Hilmarsson, 1991a, 87.

skw-ᵃññ- 'glücklich sein', 'be happy' (itr) (m/-/-)
            Prs XII (m) -,-, *skwäntär* (MQ);-,-, *skwaññentär* Imp —
                  nt-Part —
                  m-Part —
                  Ger I — Abstr I —
            Sub XII — Opt —
                  Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                  Inf *skwäntsi* (MQ)
            Pt —
            PPt —
            Ipv —
The 3.sg.mid. Prs *skwäntra* is attested in THT 4001 a 5 (reading according to
K. T. Schmidt, p.c.). Etym. A denominative based on *sakw* 'good fortune,
happiness' (Hilmarsson, 1991a, 87). The respective but unrelated TA verb
ᴬˢ ᵘ̓kaṣ-iññ- 'be happy' is formed in a parallel way.

stā- 'ändern' → *stāl-* '?'

[**stāl-** '?', a root *stäl-* or *stāl-* is set up by the manuals (cf. WTG, 301) on the
      evidence of at least three attestations from the Weber manuscript: Fill. W
      7 b 1 *(särwāna) [ṣṭ]allaṣälle*; Fill. W 8 a 3 *särwana [ṣṭ]allaṣälle* (as edited
      by Filliozat; Couvreur, 1954, 87 comments: "[n]ach dem Photo nicht sicher
      zu lesen"). Broomhead I, 9f. edits in the respective passages *(sä)[rwāna]
      [a?]llaṣälle* and *särwana (a)llaṣalle* (sic, but the manuscript indeed has
      llaṣälle), and gives the following translation and commentary of W 7 b 1:
      "disposes of jaundice from the face/rids the face of jaundice. *alaṣṣäle* is
      possibly to be reconstructed instead of the earlier reading "ṣṭalaṣṣälle".
      The MS. (facsimile) shows bad abrasion at this point in particular. The
      form is the Ger. I. of *āl-* = to remove, rid, get rid of". While this claim can
      be confirmed for W 7 b 1, where there is almost nothing left of the akṣara
      in front of *llaṣälle*, in W 8 a 3 there is, in my opinion, a lot left of the sign
      in question. First, it cannot possibly be an ⟨a⟩ as Broomhead wanted to
      restore there. I am not able to judge whether the black marks on the
      photograph under the main sign are ink remains or due to a damage on
      the manuscript, but we are certainly dealing with a ligature sign,
      although not with ⟨ṣṭa⟩; I do not venture a guess on the correct reading.
      As for the Ger II *ṣṭallaṣallesa* in Fill. W 2 b 2, Filliozat edits
      (ṣṭa)l[l]aṣa[lle]sa, and Broomhead I, 4, *[a]laṣa(lle)sa*. We are faced again
      with the problem that precisely the initial akṣara of the form is damaged.
      Judging by the ink traces, I do not think that the forms in W 2 b 2 and W 8

a 3 have the same initial akṣaras. In W 2 b 2 Filliozat's reading ⟨ṣṭa⟩ is a closer guess than ⟨a⟩, although the sign has to remain uncertain in the end. As a result one may state that at least a kausativum *ṣṭäläsk-* from a root *stāl-* is a ghost form. Finally, Adams, 1982, 136 wanted to derive the hapax *ställe* in 496, 3 (Couvreur, 1954, 91: "unclear"; WTG, 71, § 75, fn. 1 and p. 301 'ändern'; TEB II, 259 'ändern (?)') from the grundverb of the supposed root *stāl-*; for the passage, see most recently Pinault, 2008, 23, who prefers to set up a root *sät-* for this hapax from PIE *√seu̯t 's'agiter, se soulever'.]

stäm⁽ᵃ⁾- 'stehen', 'stand' (itr) (-/a/a)

      Prs — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub V (a) -,-, *stāmaṃ;* — Opt *stamoym,-, stamoy;-,-, stämom̆* (MQ)
          Ger II — Abstr II *stamalñe* Priv —
          Inf *stamatsi*
      Pt I (a) *śimāwa* (M)/*śmāwa, ścmasta/śmasta, śama/ścmā-c* (MQ);
          -,-, *stamāre/śimāre* (S);-,-, *stāmais* (sic, MQ)
      PPt *stmau | stmoṣ*
      Ipv —

käly- 'stand' provides the suppletive present stem. The subjunctive has ablaut and persistent initial accent. Instead of a 2.sg. Pt *śīmasta* from this root (thus WTG, 235; TochSprR(B) read *śīmaistä* or *śīmaista*), one has to read *vaśīr maista* in 622 a 4, as per Schmidt, 2000, 229. The 3.pl. Pt *stamār[e]* showing archaic ablaut (just like the dual) is attested in the unpublished text PK AS 15F b 4 (reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.); the 3.pl. Pt *śimāre* in the eastern text 108 a 1 (S) shows analogical reshaping; see chap. Pt I 7.1.3.8. On what seems to be a late *i*-epenthesis in the eastern Pt forms *śimāwa* and *śimāre*, see Peyrot, 2008, 57, but actually, *-i-* could go back to *-äy- with *-y- owed to the preservation of the root-initial palatalization.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I '(hin)stellen', 'put, place' (tr) (a/-/x)

      Prs IXb (a) -, *stamäst, stamäṣṣäṃ;-,-, stämäskeṃ* (MQ)
          Imp —;-,- *stamäṣyeṃ/ stamṣyeṃ*
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I *stamäṣṣäle* Abstr I —
      Sub IXb — Opt —
          Ger II *stamäṣle* Abstr II *stamäṣṣälñe* Priv —
          Inf —
      Pt I (a) *ṣṭamāwa,-,-;* —
      Pt II (x) -, *śāmasta, ścāma;* — | -, *ścāmātai* (MQ),-;—
      Pt IV (m) -, *stämäṣṣatai-ne* (Qu),-;—
      PPt *śeśśamu/śeśmu | śceścamoṣ*

Ipv II (x) *päścama;-* | *pśīmar;-*

The 2.sg. (future) Prs *stamäst* is attested in PK AS 17A b 4 (Pinault, 1984b, 169), the 3.pl. Prs (or Sub) *stämäskem* in the MQ text THT 1860 a 2, the 3.pl. Imp *stamäṣyem* in PK AS 13E b 4, the 3.pl. Imp variant *stamṣyem* in PK AS 13E b 5 (the latter two are unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the Ger I *stamäṣṣäle* in KVāc 18 a 4 (Schmidt, 1986, 50), the 1.sg. (transitive) Pt *ṣtamāwa* in PK NS 31 a 3 (Pinault, 1994, 107, fn. 4; on the phonology, see chap. Sound Laws 1.7., and on the formation chap. Pt I 7.3.7.), the 2.sg. Pt IV *stämäṣṣatai-ne* in the graffito Qu 34 (Pinault, 1994a, 176; 2000a, 158), the 2.sg. Pt II *śamasta* in PK AS 13F a 2 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.), the 3.sg. *ścāma* in H 150.122 (= IOL Toch 278) a 5 (see Broomhead I, 156, who, however, translates an Ipv form; Peyrot, 2007, s.v.), the 2.sg.mid. Pt II *ścāmātai* in THT 1540 frg. f a 3 (Schmidt, 2007, 323), the nom.sg. variant PPt *śeś[śa]m[u]* in H 149.71 a 8 (Broomhead I, 197), and the nom.sg. PPt variant *śeśmu* in FK 590 (= PK NS 40) b 3 (Couvreur, 1948, 328f.) and in H 150.108 (= IOL Toch 259) b 4 (Broomhead I, 266; Peyrot, 2007, s.v.); the PPt *śceścamoṣ* is to be read in K 9 b 5 (Sieg, 1938, 43). According to Schmidt, 2000, 228 and 231, one also has to read a preterit form //// *ścāma* //// in 615 b 5 (contra TochSprR(B)).

= [A]*ṣtäm⁽ä⁾-* 'stehen', 'stand' (itr) (-/a/a)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub V (a) -,-, *ṣtamaṣ;—* Opt —;-,-, *ṣtmiñc*
        Ger II *ṣtmāl* Abstr II *ṣtmālune*
    Pt I (a) -,-, *śäm/śmā-m;-,-, ṣtamar*
    PPt *ṣtmo*
    Ipv I (a) *päṣtam; päṣtmäs*

[A]*käly-* 'stand' provides the suppletive present stem. The 3.sg. Pt TA *śmā-m* in A 278 b 2 rather belongs to this root than to [A]*tsäm⁽ä⁾-* 'grow', and the same is true for A 20 a 4 ("the hair stood up"). TA *śäm* in A 43 b 6 is without clear context, but in A 22 a 2 and A 214 a 2 the meaning 'stood' is a fitting one. For *śmā-m* in A 278 b 2 and a contextless Ger II TA *śmāṣlan*, see also s.v. [A]*ṣtār^ᵃ?-* 'become tired' and [A]*tsäm⁽ä⁾-* 'increase'.

Kausativum I 'stellen', 'put, place' (tr) (a/a/a)

    Prs VIII (a) —;-,-, *ṣtämseñc* Imp —
        nt-Part *ṣtämsänt* (sic)
        m-Part *ṣtämsamāṃ* (sic)
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf *ṣtmässi*
    Sub IX (a) — Opt -,-, *ṣtmāṣiṣ;—*
        Ger II — Abstr II *ṣtmāṣlune*
    Pt II (a) *śaśmāwā, śaśmāṣt, śaśäm;—*

PPt *śaśmu*

Ipv II (x) *päśśäm;-| -; päśmāc*

SEM. According to Schmidt, 1992, 107, the meaning is terminative 'anhalten, stehen, bleiben, zum Stehen kommen'. ETYM. Traditionally derived from PIE *√stembʰH 'sich stützen, stemmen' (²LIV, 595); VW I, 463; Ringe, 1991, 94; Schmidt, 1992, 106ff., but this root is rather continued in *śänm-* 'bind' (as proposed by Schmidt, l.c., and 1994a, 228); differently, Winter, 1962a, 27 = 1984, 269 = 2005, 57 and Klingenschmitt, 1989, 81 = 2005, 270 (followed by Adams, DoT, 174f.) cogently rather set up a root *√stem 'set, put' thought to be a variant of *√steh₂ 'id.' (cf. PIE *√gʷem 'go' beside *√gʷeh₂ 'id.', and see also *täm-* 'be borne'). As for the root initial, palatal PT *s't regularly turns into (standard TB) *śc*/ TA *śś*, which can be further simplified to *ś*.

stäl- '?' → *stāl-* '?'

stinᵃ-sk- 'schweigen', 'be silent' (itr) (-/m/-)

Prs — Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub IXa (m) —; *stināskemtär,-,-* Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
Inf *stināstsi*
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

TochSprR(B), glossary, 189 lists a 3.sg. Opt *stināskoy* without ref., but there is reason to believe that the form refers to 154 (= H 149.22) b 4. Thomas, 1978, 123 also discusses such a form (without text reference), stating that instead of *stināskoy* one has to read *nāskoy*, which is indeed true for the passage 154 b 4 (see s.v. *nāskᵃ-* 'spin'). The 1.pl.mid. Sub *stināskemtär* is attested in PK AS 17B a 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

KAUSATIVUM I 'zum Schweigen bringen', 'make silent' (tr) (—)

Prs — Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv IV (m) *pstināṣṣar;-*

stuwᵃ- '?' → *tsuw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'attach'

staukk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'anschwellen', 'swell' (itr) (m/-/-)

        Prs VI (m) -,-, *staukkanatär-me*;— Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt I in

        PPt *stastaukkauwa*

        Ipv —

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'anschwellen lassen', 'make swell' (tr) (a+/-/-)

        Prs IXb (a+) -,-, *staukkäṣṣäṃ*;— Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part *staukkäskemane*

                Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

The PPt *śeśśukoṣ* in 82 a 1 does not belong to this root, but rather to *kuk-* '± tire', as per Winter, 1984, 213 = 2005, 270. Sᴇᴍ./Eᴛʏᴍ. See the discussion by Winter, 1982b, 212ff. = 2005, 269ff. (contra WTG, 301; TEB II, 258).

snätkʔ- 'durchdringen, durchsickern', 'suffuse, permeate, imbue' (?) (—)

        Prs — Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt ? in

        PP *snätku*

        Ipv —

The reading *sn-* (not *st-*) is certain. A PPt formation of that kind is only attested from roots without A-character, notably with a small group of roots forming Pt III and with some irregular verbs (see chap. PPt 14.1.1.1.).

~ ᴬ***snotkʔ-*** 'durchdringen, durchsickern', 'suffuse, permeate, imbue' (?) (—)

        Prs — Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf —

Sub — Opt —

       Ger II — Abstr II —

Pt ? in

PP *sāsnotku*

Ipv —

According to Melchert, 1978, 117f., the TB and TA roots are cognates, while TEB II set up two different verbs *snätk-* 'durchdringen' and *ᴬsnotk-* 'müde, schlaff werden' (thus also Couvreur, 1956, 72: *ᴬsnotk-* '± erschöpft sein').

ᴬsnotk²- 'suffuse' → *snätk²-* 'id.'

*spānt*ᵃ*-* → *spänt*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'trust'

spārtt⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'sich drehen; sich verhalten; sich befinden', 'turn; behave; be'

       (itr) (m/x/a)

       Prs IV (m) -,-, *sporttotär*;-,-, *sporttontär* Imp -,-, *sporttitär*;—

             nt-Part —

             m-Part *sporttomane*

             Ger I *sporttolle* Abstr I —

       Sub V (x) *spārttau*,-, *spārtaṃ*; *spārttam*,-,-

             Opt *spārttoym*,-, *spārtoy*;— | -,-, *spārtoytär* (MQ);—

             Ger II — Abstr II *spārttalyñe/spārttalñe* Priv —

             Inf *spārtatsi*

       Pt I (a) *spartāwa*,-, *spārtta*;—

       PPt *paspārttau* | *päspārttaṣ* (MQ)

       Ipv —

The 3.sg. Opt *spārtoy* is attested in PK NS 48 + 258 a 6 (Pinault, 1994, 185), the 1.sg. Pt *(spa)rtāwa* is to be restored in H add.149 62 b 5 (Couvreur, 1966, 165), and beside simplified *spārta* in 44 b 8, the 3.sg. Pt *spārtta* is found in THT 1247 b 3. The subjunctive has persistent initial accent. For the Priv *eṣpirtacce*, see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.2.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'drehen', 'turn' (tr) (a/a/a)

       Prs IXb (a) -,-, *ṣparttaṣṣäṃ/spārttaṣṣäṃ*;-,-, *spārttaskeṃ* Imp —

             nt-Part —

             m-Part —

             Ger I *spārttäṣälya* (MQ) Abstr I —

       Sub IXb (a) — Opt *ṣpartaṣṣim*,-,-;—

             Ger II — Abstr II *spārtṣlñe* Priv —

             Inf *spārtassi/spārttässi-ne*

       Pt II (a) -,-, *ṣpyārta*;—

       PPt *peṣpirttu*

       Ipv —

(s)pārttäṣälya (arguably Ger I) is attested in PK AS 12E (MQ) b 6 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The Prs/Sub IXb stem shows the three allomorphs: *spārttäsk/ṣṣ-* (regular formation), *spārttäsk-*

(preservation of A-character), and *ṣpärttāsk/ṣṣ-* (attesting to a former Prs stem with pre-PT *e-vowel PT *s'p'ärtw(ā)-, also still to be seen in the Priv *eṣpirtacce* 'unturned' and in the Pt II); see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.2.

= *^Aspārtw^(a)-* 'sich drehen; sich verhalten; sich befinden', 'turn; behave; be'

> (itr) (x/a/a)
>
> Prs II (a) -,-, *sparcwṣ-äṃ;* — Imp —
> > nt-Part —
> > m-Part —
> > Ger I — Abstr I —
>
> Prs IV (m) -,-, *sparcwatär;-,-, sparcwantär* Imp —
> > nt-Part *sparcwäntāśśi*
> > m-Part *sparcwmāṃ*
> > Ger I — Abstr I —
> > Inf —
>
> Sub V (a) -,-, *spārtwaṣ;-,-, spārtweñc* Opt —
> > Ger II — Abstr II *spārtwlune*
>
> Pt I (a) *spārtwā,-, spārttu;* —
> PPt *sāspärtwu*
> Ipv —

An active, intransitive present stem of Class II standing beside a Prs IV verb is extremely odd. However, there is reason to believe that the 3.sg. Prs TA *sparcwṣ-äṃ* is not simply an error for TA †*sparcwaṣ-äṃ* (thus Winter, 1991, 47 = 2005, 424, who also analyzes the *m*-Part TA *sparcwmāṃ* as a Class II form without discussion, though this form is ambiguous). The palatalized root final in the present stem forms of Class IV is very odd as well. Note that the only attestation of the *nt*-Part *sparcwäntāśśi* may as well belong to the Prs II stem, the more since it would be the only example of a Prs IV *nt*-Part.

KAUSATIVUM I 'drehen', 'turn' (tr) (a+/-/a)

> Prs VIII (a+) -,-, *spārtwäṣ;-,-, spārtwseñc*
> > Imp *spārtwṣā, spārtwṣāṣt, spārtwṣā;* —
> > nt-Part *spārtwṣant*
> > m-Part *spārtwäsmāṃ*
> > Ger I — Abstr I —
>
> Sub IX — Opt —
> > Ger II — Abstr II *spārtwäṣlune*
> > Inf —
>
> Pt II (a) -,-, *saspärtu;* —
> Pt IV in
> PPt *sāspärtwṣu*
> Ipv —

The imperfect form TA *spārtwṣā* is 1.sg. in A 270 a 6 and 3.sg. in A 214 a 3 (see Pinault, 1997, 126). The PPt TA *sāspärtwṣūnt* in A 218 a 4 may be without direct context, though the Sanskrit parallel (Uv 21.6 d) as identified by Sieg/Siegling has Skt. *aprativartitaṃ* 'not having made turned (back)' (said of

the wheel of law), cf. SWTF, s.v.: "nicht zurückgedreht", i.e., "was nicht zurückgedreht werden kann".

SEM. Being a (basically intransitive) verb of motion it can be construed with obliquus of direction; see Thomas, 1983, 13, fn. 18. ETYM. According to Adams, DoT, 715f., the verb is denominative, the underlying noun being attested in *spertte* 'function, behavior (?)' (but see rather Winter, 1972, 389 = 1984, 210 = 2005, 161) and in TA *spartu* 'lock, curled hair'. Nevertheless, I agree that this is a denominative and think we are dealing with an inherited form in *-oh₁-i̯e/o- (> TB Prs IV) beside which there was also a stem in *-ei̯e/o- (> Prs II and possibly also TA Prs IV). The former present stem with what looks like a pre-PT *e-vowel was in my view modeled on a similarly structured one made from the root *pänn^a-* 'stretch'; actually, both roots also must have had *o*-grade presents in *-u̯ei̯e/o-; see chap. Prs III/IV 26.5.3.

^Aspārtw^(a)- 'turn' → *spārtt^(a)-* 'id.'

spālk^(a?)- '± ringen um', '± strive actively/forcefully for' (itr) (m/-/m)
　　　　Prs IXa (m) —;-,-, *spalkkaskentär-ñ* Imp —;-,-, *spalkaṣyentär*
　　　　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　　　　m-Part *spalkaskemane*
　　　　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
　　　　Sub — Opt —
　　　　　　　　Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
　　　　　　　　Inf —
　　　　Pt I (m) -,-, *spalkāte;* —
　　　　PPt —
　　　　Ipv —

The 3.pl.mid. Prs *spalkkaskentär-ñ* (sic) is attested in a Paris text without signature, the *m*-Part *spalkaskema(ne)* in PK AS 13F a 5 (Couvreur, 1954, 84). Since there are only middle forms attested so far, active *spalkaṣyeṃ* in 100 b 4 should better be restored to a middle form *spalkaṣyeṃ(tär)*; see Thomas, ²TochSprR(B), 252f., who lists yet another attestation of a 3.pl.mid. Imp *spalkaṣyentär* from an unpublished Berlin text without reference, which is arguably also quoted by Krause, 1961, 176: *wnolm(i) spalkaṣyentär läkṣī ramt kentsa* "die Wesen mühten sich wie Fische auf dem Land" (now = THT 1573 frg. a b 4). In DA 1 (= PK NS 398) a 1 one has to read 3.sg. Pt *spalkāte-ne* (Pinault, 1988a, 179, with fn. 1; listed as uncertain reading by WTG, 303).

~ *^Aspāltk^(a?)-* '± ringen um', '± strive actively/forcefully for' (itr) (m/-/-)
　　　　Prs VII (m) —;-,-, *spāltäṅkāntär* Imp —
　　　　　　　　nt-Part —
　　　　　　　　m-Part *spāltäṅkāmāṃ*
　　　　　　　　Ger I — Abstr I —
　　　　　　　　Inf —
　　　　Sub — Opt —
　　　　　　　　Ger II — Abstr II —
　　　　Pt —

PPt —

Ipv —

SEM. The meaning is a matter of controversy. TG, 490; WTG, 302; Schmidt, 1974, 175f.; Thomas, ²TochSprR(B), 252f.; and Adams, DoT, 716f. derive the verb from *spelkte* 'zeal' and consequently translate '± sich beeifern', '± be zealous, make an effort'. In contrast, Couvreur, 1954, 84f. proposed 'sich wälzen'; similarly, Winter, 1984a, 120 = 2005, 265, who translated 'flap around, crawl' in 100 b 4. According to D. Q. Adams (p.c.), the latter is indeed to be preferred, because out of the eight occurrences in TA and TB, two (one in TA and one in TB) are collocated with adverbs of motion, one instance (100 b 4) has actually three such adverbs. He further points out that a meaning 'act/move with force' works everywhere; when there is no goal, as in THT 1573, the meaning is something like 'thrash about'; when it takes an infinitive as direct object we have 'strive actively/forcefully for'; in that case, the noun *spelkte*/TA *spaltäk* 'zeal' would derive from the verbal stem. ETYM. The root vocalism and the TA Prs VII point to a root with A-character, but the present stem in TB does not show A-character (it is more likely that the stem is to be interpreted as *spālkásk*-). Note that in TA the root ends in -*tk*, whereas in TB the root seems to end in plain -*k*, though in the respective noun formations we have the variants TA *spaltäk* 'zeal' and TB *spelke(°)* (often) beside *spelkke(°)* (less often), and *speltke* (once in the manuscript 333). Since 333 is written in late common archaic ductus and has many archaisms (to be sure, the text has the air of having been archaized on purpose), the stem should be set up as PT *spæltk(ā)-. Winter, 1971, 219 = 1984, 42 = 2005, 152 proposed that the noun is a loan from an Iranian source, followed by Tremblay, 2005a, 426, who sets up OIran. *spardaka- as proto-form by assuming a sound law OIran. *rd > PT *lt (in contrast to OIran. *rt > PT *rt, p. 424), but as far as I can see this would be the only example for such a sound law.

ᴬ*spāltk*ᵃ?- '± strive' → *spālk*ᵃ?- 'id.'

spāw⁽ᵃ⁾- 'vergehen, kleiner werden', 'subside, diminish' (itr) (m/a/a)

    Prs IV (m) -,-, *spowotär*;— Imp —

        nt-Part —

        m-Part —

        Ger I — Abstr I —

    Sub V (a) -,-, *spāwaṃ*;— Opt —

        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv *aspāwatte*

        Inf —

    Pt I (a) —;-,-, *spawāre-ñ*

    PPt —

    Ipv —

spāwaṃ is attested as gloss in SHT 5, 1081 (at least judging by the facsimile provided in SHT), which may be a 3.sg. Sub of this root. The 3.pl. Pt *spawāre-ñ* is found in SI B Toch./11, 2 (Pinault, 1998, 8).

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'verringern, reduzieren', 'reduce' (tr) (-/-/a)

        Prs — Imp —
               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
               Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
               Inf —
        Pt IV (a) —;-,-, *spāwäṣar* (sic)
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 3.pl. Pt *spāwäṣar* is attested in SI B Toch./9, 3 (Pinault, 1998, 4).
Sᴇᴍ. In H 149.81 a 3 the 3.sg.mid. Prs *spowoträ* is used as antonym to
tseṅketrä 'arises'. In the St. Petersburg business documents the verb is used
with respect to livestock (see Pinault, 1998, 4, with fn. 4). The Priv
a[s](p)ā(watte) is, according to Schmidt, 1990, 475, also attested as gloss on
Skt. *ānejya-* 'unbeweglich, unerschütterlich' in SHT 5, 1109 (also attested
otherwise; see Hilmarsson, 1991, 35f.). Eᴛʏᴍ. For a proposal, see Hilmarsson,
1991, 36.

spänt⁽ᵃ⁾- 'vertrauen', 'trust' (itr) (m/m/-)

        Prs III (m) —;-, *späntetär*, *spänteṁntär* Imp —
               nt-Part —
               m-Part —
               Ger I *späntelle* Abstr I —
        Sub V (m) — Opt -,-, *späntoytär*; —
               Ger II — Abstr II *späntālñe* Priv —
               Inf —
        Pt I in
        PPt *späntauwa| späntoṣ*
        Ipv —

The restoration *(spä)ntoyträ* in 2 a 6 is certain, cf. ²TochSprR(B), 141. The Abstr
späntālñe speaks against a subjunctive with initial accent. Hence, the
restoration to *(sp)[ā]ntoyträ* in 139 b 5 as proposed in TochSprR(B) followed
by WTG, 303 is not likely, because in MQ texts /ä/ is never rendered by ⟨ā⟩ (cf.
Peyrot, 2008, 34f.), and we do not expect a Sub V stem allomorph *spāntā-*
either, because this allomorph should also show up in the abstract and,
moreover, such a stem would imply a likewise Pt I stem allomorph *spāntā-*,
which in turn would be reflected by a PPt †*paspāntau* (but cf. the case of
spärk⁽ᵃ⁾- 'disappear'); since the preceding part of the pāda in 139 b 5 is lost, a
form of this verb is not even required by the context. I cannot make a guess
for the correct restoration; a restoration *[p](l)[ā]ntoyträ* from *plānt⁽ᵃ⁾-* can be
excluded because one would expect to see some remains of the *l*-sign. To be
sure, the existence of a different root *spānt ᵃ-* '?' cannot be excluded, and the

isolated form *spantāmar* in THT 1173 b 4 may indeed belong to such a root: *makte yknesa spantāmar* "in whatever form I ...".

KAUSATIVUM I 'vertrauen lassen, bewirken', 'make trust' (tr) (a/-/-)

       Prs IXb (a) -,-, *spantäṣäṃ* (sic); — Imp —
              nt-Part —
              m-Part —
              Ger I *spantäṣälona* (sic) Abstr I —
       Sub — Opt —
              Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
              Inf —
       Pt II in
       PPt *peṣpiṃtu*
       Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *ṣpantäṣäṃ* cited by Thomas, 1997, 117 is attested in THT 1192 b 5 and THT 1317 frg. b a 2.

= ᴬ*spänt*ᴮ- 'vertrauen', 'trust' (itr) (m/-/a)

       Prs III (m) —;-,-, *smäntantr-äṃ* (sic) Imp —
              nt-Part —
              m-Part —
              Ger I — Abstr I —
              Inf —
       Sub V — Opt —
              Ger II *späntāl* Abstr II *späntālune*
       Pt I (a) -,-, *spänt;*-,-, *spantar*
       PPt *spänto*
       Ipv —

The 3.pl.mid. Prs TA *smäntantr-äṃ* in A 386 b 1 is a misspelling (or rather copyist's error) for TA †*späntantr-äṃ*. TA *spänt* attested after lacuna in A 119 a 3 may be a 3.sg. Pt of this root, cf. TG, 480. The 3.pl. Pt is now arguably attested in YQ 9 b 2; see Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998, 60ff. with fn. 11, and Schmidt, 1999b, 283.

SEM. The grundverb is construed with secondary cases (commitative and perlative). It is difficult to decide whether construction with obliquus is also possible. Carling, 2000, 25f., fn. 114 refers to Kölver, 1965, 160, fn. 6 (ad chap. 4), who quotes 2 b 2 for such a case, but Sieg/Siegling rather translate here: "sie haben das Vertrauen: ewig [ist] das Leben", i.e., they take *śaul* not as the object, but as the subject of a following nominal sentence. ETYM. Usually derived from PIE *√spend 'libieren' (²LIV, 577f.; cf. Adams, DoT, 717 with ref.; see also Forssman, 1994, 105f.); for PIE *-nd- > Toch. -*nt*-, see s.v. *plänt*[(a)]- 'rejoice'.

spärk[(a)]- 'verloren gehen, verschwinden', 'disappear, perish' (itr) (m/m/a)

       Prs III (m) -,-, *spärketär;*-,-, *spärkentär* Imp -,-, *spärkītär;* —
              nt-Part —
              m-Part —
              Ger I — Abstr I —

Sub V (m) — Opt -,-, *spärkoytär*, —
        Ger II *spärkälle/sparkālye* (Š, sic) Abstr II *spärkālñe* Priv —
        Inf —
Pt I (a) -,-, *sparkā-ne* (Š, sic); —
PPt *spärkau*｜*spärkoṣ/sparkoṣ* (sic)
Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. Prs *spärketär* is also attested in THT 1427 b 4, THT 3272 a 2, and IOL Toch 791 a 2 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.), and the Opt *spärkoytär-ñ* also in THT 1326 b 2 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). The more regular Ger II *spärkāl(l)e* is found in the small fragment THT 3258 a 1 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.), and the PPt *spärko(ṣäṃ)ts* in IOL Toch 568 frg. a a 3 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.); the variant PPt *sparkoṣ* is attested in the monastery record PK Cp 32, 7 (Pinault, 1984a, 24); a form *(spä)rkoṣ* is also restored by TochSprR(B) in 405 b 3. Pace Saito, 2006, 225, the PPt *spärkau* does not have transitive meaning. Since we have three attestations of a stem allomorph *spārkā-* in the Sub (Ger II *sparkālye*), finite Pt (*sparkā-ne*), and PPt (*sparkoṣ*), one should indeed rather reckon with the existence of such an allomorph than dismiss these forms as mere errors; see the discussion in chap.s Pt I 7.1.3.5. and Sub V 18.2.11.

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'sich verlieren', 'fehlen', 'get lost', 'go astray' (itr) (-/a/-)
        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub II (a) -,-, *ṣparśaṃ* (sic);-,-, *ṣpärkeṃ* (sic) Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

ṣparśaṃ is attested without context in KVāc 26 a 1 (Schmidt, 1986, 58), which may be a 3.sg. Sub of this stem (if separated correctly).

KAUSATIVUM II 'vergehen lassen, vernichten', 'cause to disappear, destroy' (tr) (a/a/m)
        Prs IXb (a) -,-, *ṣparkäṣṣäṃ*; — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *ṣparkäṣäle/ṣpärkaṣṣälle* Abstr I —
        Sub IXb (a) — Opt -,-, *ṣparkäṣṣi*; —
                Ger II — Abstr II *ṣparkäṣälñe* Priv —
                Inf *ṣpärkastsi* (MQ)
        Pt II (m) -, *ṣpyarkatai-ne* (MQ),-; —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *ṣ[p]arkaṣṣan-ne* is also attested in THT 3599 (= Mainz 655, 3, MQ) in a piece glued to line 7 of frg. a, which, however, cannot belong there. The Ger I *ṣparkäṣäle* is attested in KVāc 16 a 4 (Schmidt, 1986, 48), and the regular

IXb accent is also found in the *uki*-form *ṣparkäṣṣukiṃ*; the irregularly accented Ger *ṣpärkaṣṣälle* is found two times in the Weber manuscript: in M 1 b 2 and, according to K. T. Schmidt, also in the medical text 505 b 2 = SHT 3, 902, h (see also Schmidt 1997, 250f. and 2000, 227). On the Class IXb stem allomorphs, see chap. Prs/Sub IX 31.1.4.2.

= ^A*spärk^(ä)-* 'verloren gehen, verschwinden', 'disappear, perish' (itr) (-/-/a)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub V — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *spärkālune/spräkālune* (sic)
        Pt I (a) -,-, *spärk/spärkā-ṃ*; —
        PPt *spärko*
        Ipv —

The Abstr TA *spräkālune* (sic) is attested as gloss on Skt. *vipātanā* 'Vernichtung, Beseitigung' in SHT 8, 1818 (reading: K. T. Schmidt).

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'sich verlieren', 'get lost, disappear' (itr) (-/?/a)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub I in *ṣpärkä°* Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt III (a) -,-, *spärksā-m*; —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

A subjunctive, most probably 3.sg.act. TA *ṣpär[kä](ṣ)* may underlie the damaged form TA *ṣpärkä* //// in A 234 a 4 and a 5: A 234 a 4 *āśai spärko sas ṣpärkä(ṣ)* "having lost the disposition (Skt. *āśaya-*), he will get lost/lose ...". Note that the TB Sub II also shows initial palatalization.

KAUSATIVUM II 'vergehen lassen, vernichten', 'cause to disappear, destroy' (tr) (x/-/m)

        Prs VIII (x) -,-, *spärkäṣ*;-,-, *spärkseñc* | —;-,-, *spärksantär* Imp —
                nt-Part *spärkṣant*
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub IX — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *ṣpärkāṣlune*
        Pt II (m) —;-,-, *saspärkānt*
        PPt *ṣaspärku*
        Ipv —

SEM. Most remarkably, the antigrundverb is intransitive, at least the two certain forms in both languages are; see the discussion in chap. Valency 4.5.1.1.2. The same pattern is attested for the antigrundverb of *trik*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* 'go astray, etc.'. The TA Prs VIII stem can formally either belong to the antigrundverb or to the kausativum, though all clear attestations seem to belong to the kausativum (A 65 b 2 *puk ākālntu spärkṣant* "destroying all wishes"; A 302 a 8 *ṣakkatsek metrakṣināṃ opṣäly mā spärkäṣ* "[who] certainly does not miss the period of the Maitreya", cf. Schmidt, 1996, 274; on TA *opṣäly*, see now rather Pinault in Geng/Laut/Pinault, 2004a, 49, fn. 94). ETYM. Probably to be derived from PIE *√spergʰ 'sich beeilen' (²LIV, 581, without Toch.); see Adams, DoT, 718.

ᴬsmänt- → *ᴬspänt̂ᵃ-* 'trust'

smi- 'lächeln', 'smile' (itr) (—)

    Prs I — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *smimane*
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub I — Opt —
        Ger II *smīlle* Abstr II *smilñe* Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

A 3.sg. Prs *smiyäṃ* is only listed in TEB II, 260 without ref. and may be reconstructed.

= *ᴬsmi-* 'lächeln', 'smile' (itr) (—)

    Prs I — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *smimāṃ*
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√smei̯ 'lachen, lächeln' (²LIV, 568f.); see Adams, DoT, 721.

syᵃ- 'sweat' → *siyᵃ-* 'id.'

sräṅk- → *särk*⁽ᵃ⁾*-* '± take care of; pull (?)'

sruk^ä- 'sterben', 'die' (itr) (m/a/a)

        Prs III (m) -,-, *sruketär*;-,-, *srukentär* Imp —;-,-, *srukyentär*
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *srukemane*
                Ger I *srukelle* Abstr I —
        Sub V (a) *sraukau*,-, *sraukaṃ*;— Opt -,-, *srūkoy*;—
                Ger II *srukalle/srukālle* (MQ) Abstr II *srukalñe* Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt I (a) *srukāwa*,-, *sruka*; *srukām*, *srukās*, *srukāre*
        PPt *srukau* | *srukoṣ*
        Ipv —

The manuals list a middle Opt *srukoyentär* that is based on a restoration *(sruko)yentär* in 25 a 4 (e.g., ²TochSprR(B), 186); however, Schmidt, 1974, 46, fn. 1 doubts the correctness of this restoration because of the fragmentary context; there is indeed also a serious morphological problem for this restoration, since such a middle form from a subjunctive stem with ablaut and persistent initial accent would be unique (see chap. Sub I/V 18.2.5.).

= ^A***sruk-*** 'töten', 'kill' (tr) (-/-/m)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt II (m) -,-, *sasrukāt*;—
        Pt III (m) -,-, *sruksāt*;—
        PPt *sasruku/sāsruku*
        Ipv —

There is no difference in meaning or function between Pt II and Pt III. The PPt variant TA *sāsruku* in A 160 a 3 is either a mere error or has analogical Cā- taken over from PPts to Pt I stems from roots of the structure CoC^ä-.

Etym. Adams, DoT, 723 with ref. derives the root from PIE *√streu̯g 'streichen, abwischen' (²LIV, 605, without Toch.); differently, Meillet, 1911, 461 assumed a *k*-extension of PIE *√sreu̯ 'fließen, strömen' (²LIV, 588, without Toch.), a suggestion rather met with favor by Melchert, 1978, 115. Most recently, Hackstein, 2003b, 84 preferred *√su̯ergʰ 'krank sein, sich sorgen' (²LIV, 613f.).

^A***slāṅk-ⁱñ̃-*** '?' (?) (—)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub XII — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II *slāṅkiñlune*

Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

Unclear hapax in A 50 a 1: //// *śla slāṅkiñlune omlaṃ ākrunt swāsä(ṣ)* ////
"with … (s)he let rain hot tears". ETYM. Hilmarsson, 1991a, 93f. compares the
adverb *slakkare*/TA *slākkär*, the meaning of which also remains uncertain.

släpp[ä?]*-* '± herunterfallen, einsinken', '± fall into, sink in' (?) (−)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt I in
    PPt *släppoṣ*
    Ipv —

Hapax in 331 a 1; for a detailed discussion of the passage, see Winter, 2003a,
105ff. Judging by the PPt formation, the root has A-character.

swār[a]*-* 'gefallen', 'please' (itr) (−)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *swāralñe* (MQ) Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

KAUSATIVUM I 'sich Gefallen lassen, genießen', 'have pleasure in, enjoy'
    (tr) (m/-/m)
    Prs IXb (m) -,-, *swārästär*; — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt IV (m) —;-, *swāräṣṣat*,-
    PPt —
    Ipv —

= ^A*swār⁽ä⁾?-* 'sich Gefallen lassen, genießen', 'have pleasure in, enjoy'
      (tr) (m/-/-)
      Prs VIII (m) -, *swārāṣtār*,-;-,-, *swārsantär* Imp —
            nt-Part —
            m-Part —
            Ger I — Abstr I —
            Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt —
      PPt —
      Ipv —
Pace TEB II, 39, no. X, 10, Schmidt, 1983, 128 and 1987, 158f. reads and restores a 2.sg.mid. Prs TA *swā(rä)ṣt(ār)* in A 244 b 3 on account of the Sanskrit parallel version.
ETYM. Most likely a denominative based on *swāre* 'sweet'; see Adams, DoT, 725.

^{AB}*swās⁸-* 'rain' → *suw^ā-*/ ^A*suw⁽ä⁾-* 'id.'

TS

^A*tsak-* '?' → ^A*yäw-* 'enter'

tsāk- '(auf)leuchten', 'glow' (itr) (m/-/m)
      Prs VIII (m) —;-,-, *tsaksentär* Imp -,-, *tsakṣitär*;-,-, *tsakṣīyentär*
            nt-Part —
            m-Part *tsaksemane*
            Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
            Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
            Inf —
      Pt III (m) -,-, *tsāksate* (MQ); —
      PPt —
      Ipv —
According to Schmidt, 1974, 20, fn. 3, the 3.pl.mid. Prs *tsaksentär* in 567 a 2, the *m*-Part *tsaksemane* in 154 b 4, H 149.add 116 b 1, and H 149.342 b 4, and the 3.pl.mid. Imp *tsakṣīyentär-ne* in H 149.323 a 2 belong to this stem and not to *tsäk-* 'burn'. This seems also to be true for the 3.sg.mid. Imp *tsakṣiträ* that is now attested in THT 1191 a 2: //// *(ṣe)kka-ṣekka tsakṣitr̲a̲* • 1 "it glowed forever".
= ^A*tsāk-* '(auf)leuchten', 'glow' (itr) (m/m/m)
      Prs VIII (m) -,-, *tsākäṣtär*; — Imp —
            nt-Part —

        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub I/II (m) — Opt —;-,-, *tsāśintär*
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt III (m) —;-,-, *tsāksānt*
    PPt —
    Ipv —

According to Schmidt, 1974, 20f., fn. 4 (contra TG, 481; TEB II, 159), the 3.sg. Imp TA *tsākñā* in A 295 a 3 does not belong to this root, but to ^{AB}*tsāk^a*- 'pierce, bite' (see s.v.). Etym. To be derived from PIE *√d^{h}eg^{uh} 'mit Feuer behandeln, verbrennen' (^{2}LIV, 133f.); see Adams, DoT, 731. For the generalized *-ō- in the root, see Peters, 2004, 434, fn. 24.

tsāk^a- '(aus)stechen, beißen', 'pierce, bite' (tr) (a/a/a)
    Prs VI (a) -,-, *tsāknaṃ*;— Imp -,-, *tsaknoy* (sic);-,-, *tsaknoyeñ-c*
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub V (a) -,-, *tsākaṃ*;— Opt —
        Ger II *tsakālla* Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf —
    Pt I (a) -,-, *tsāka*;—
    PPt *tsatsākau*
    Ipv —

tsakno(y) //// in 154 a 6 should be further restored to a form with enclitic pronoun in order to explain the accent, as per Thomas, 1979, 166, fn. 81. TochSprR(B), glossary, 192 lists an Inf *tsaktsi* (sic) under this root, which may refer to *tsaktsi* attested in H 149.add 114 b 3, but this form belongs to *tsäk-* 'burn'. The Ger II *tsakālla* is attested in THT 1158 a 3 (cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.), and *tsakāll(·)* also in IOL Toch 363 b 2 (see Peyrot, 2007, s.v.). The subjunctive stem seems to have non-initial accent.
= ^{A}*tsāk^a*- 'stechen', 'pierce' (tr) (a/-/-)
    Prs VI (a) — Imp -,-, *tsākñā*;—
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

According to Schmidt, 1974, 20f., fn. 4, the 3.sg.act. Imp TA *tsākñā* in A 295 a 3 belongs to this root (pace TG, 481; TEB II, 159); see also the discussion of the passage sub ^{A}*wāt^a*- '± thrust, stab'.

ETYM. Belongs either with Gk. δάκνω 'bite' (the root of which behaves as if stemming from *dHḱ-; and see also the discussion by Adams, DoT, 731 and ²LIV, 117f., fn. 1 with ref.) or PIE *√dʰei̯Hgʷ 'hineinstecken, stechen' (²LIV, 142), as first proposed by Ringe, 1991, 71 (note that the meaning 'bite' is in Tocharian only attested with respect to reptiles), either via *dʰiHgʷ- or *dʰi̯oHgʷ-.

tsāpᵃ- '(zer)quetschen', 'mash, crush' (?) (—)

   Prs VI — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I *tsapanale* Abstr I —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt I in
   PPt *tsatsāpau*
   Ipv —

~ ᴬ**tsāw-** '?' (?) (—)

   Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt IV in
   PPt in *tsātsäwṣuräṣ*
   Ipv —

SEM. TEB II, 159 and 261 translates both the TB and TA root with 'zerreiben, zerstoßen', WTG, 305 proposes 'zerstoßen, zerquetschen, klemmen (?)'. In TB, the verb is used with respect to preparing fish (Fill. P 1 a 2, cf. Sieg, 1955, 68) and with respect to a product of the *khadira*-tree (Acacia catechu, Cutch tree) being stuck to a door (*twerene*) in Fill. M 2 a 2, so that 'mash, crush' may be the most likely translation (cf. Sieg, 1955, 80; for the locative in this passage, see Carling, 2000, 167). The reference of the TA absolutive in A 431 a 2 is lost: //// *m tsātsäwṣuräṣ riyac kälk sām penu* "having ..., (s)he went back to the city; and she ..." (TG, 481 does not translate the verb; Poucha, TLT, s.v. proposes 'tepidum facere (?)'; Couvreur, 1956, 70 translates 'zerreiben'). ETYM. Traditionally derived from PIE *√dʰebʰ 'vermindern' (²LIV, 132f., without Toch.), cf. VW I, 525 just like *tsopʾ-* 'sting, poke'. Differently, Hackstein, 2001, 19 derives the root from PIE *√deh₂p 'zerteilen' (Gk. δάπτω 'zerfleische', etc., ²LIV, 104 without this Toch. root).

tsārk^ᵃ- 'erhitzen, herausbrennen; quälen', 'heat, burn [out]; torture' (tr) (a/-/-)

        Prs VI (a) — Imp —;-,-, *tsarkanoyeñ-c*

                nt-Part —

                m-Part —

                Ger I *tsarkanalle* Abstr I —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —

                Inf —

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs *tsärkanaṃ* listed in TEB I, 208, § 376 is probably only (wrongly) reconstructed on account of the attested imperfect. *tsarkanoyeñ-c* in 231 a 5 (although it has the siglum 'M') comes from the Kuča region, but does not have MQ character, rather informal-style features (cf. Peyrot, 2008, 220 "classical~late"). Similar informal-style features appear in H add.149 86 = IOL Toch 213 (cf. Peyrot, 2008, 231), where the Ger I *tsarkanalle* 'to be burnt [out]' is found in a 5. Although the root is no doubt cognate to semantically similar *tsärk-* 'heat, burn (out); torture', it seems we are faced here with a stem **tsārkā-* to be set apart synchronically and not simply acting as a grundverb stem from that *tsärk-* (judging by transitive *tsarkanoyeñ-c* "they burnt/tortured you"). The Ger II forms listed by the manuals as grundverb formations belong to *tsärk-*; see s.v.

^Atsārt^ᵃ?- 'weinen', 'weep' (itr) (m/-/a)

        Prs I/II (m) -, *śe(-)r,-*;— Imp —

                nt-Part —

                m-Part *śertmāṃ*

                Ger I — Abstr I —

                Inf —

        Sub — Opt —

                Ger II — Abstr II —

        Pt I (a) *tsārtā,-,-;-,-,-, tsārtar*

        PPt —

        Ipv —

TA *śe(··)r* in A 79 b 1 must be restored to a 2. singular present of this root (cf. Sieg, Übers. II, 13 with fn. 15), but there is some uncertainty about the present stem class. The manuals restore a Prs I form TA *śe(rttā)r*. With respect to the active Pt I forms, one might have rather expected a Class IV Prs. However, the regular Class IV form †*śertacär* does not fit into the lacuna. Winter, 1991, 47 = 2005, 424 (who is only concerned with the *m*-Part) analyzes the present stem as a thematic one, so that one would have to restore to a 2.sg. Prs *śe(rctā)r* in A 79 b 1. To be sure, the *m*-Part can also be a Prs I form, so that the manual's restoration TA *śe(rttā)r* remains as likely. Note that the root vowel of TA *śert-* is odd, so that VW I, 524 assumed a borrowing from TB, but then one should

have expected †*tsert-* (see chap. Sound Laws 1.2.); probably PT *ts'ært- had turned into pre-TA *ts'æyrt- by a preservation process.

tsārw⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich trösten, Mut fassen', 'be comforted, take heart' (itr) (-/m/-)

     Prs — Imp —
         nt-Part —
         m-Part —
         Ger I — Abstr I —
     Sub V (m) — Opt -,-, *tsārwoytär*; —
         Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
         Inf —
     Pt I in
     PPt *tsatsārwaṣ*
     Ipv —

The accent of the subjunctive stem is unclear, because the sole attestation seems to come from a text with MQ character (U 15 a 1; cf. Peyrot, 2008, 233). The PPt *tsatsārwaṣ* is attested in PK AS 17E b 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'trösten', 'comfort, console' (tr) (x/-/m)

     Prs IXb (x) *tsārwäskemar*,-, *tsārwästär-me*; —
         Imp -, *tsārwäṣṣit-me*,-; —
         nt-Part —
         m-Part —
         Ger I — Abstr I —
     Sub IXb — Opt —
         Ger II — Abstr II *tsārwäṣälyñe* Priv —
         Inf *tsārwästsi*
     Pt IV (m) *tsārwäṣṣāmai* (MQ),-, *tsārwäṣṣate*; —
     PPt —
     Ipv IV (m) -; *ptsārwaṣṣat-ne*

= ᴬ*tsārw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'sich trösten, Mut fassen', 'be comforted, take heart' (itr) (m/-/m)

     Prs IV (m) -,-, *tsarwatär*; — Imp —
         nt-Part —
         m-Part —
         Ger I — Abstr I —
         Inf —
     Sub — Opt —
         Ger II — Abstr II —
     Pt I (m) —;-,-, *tsārwant*
     PPt *tsātsärwu*
     Ipv —

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'trösten', 'comfort, console' (tr) (—)

     Prs VIII — Imp —
         nt-Part *tsārwṣant*
         m-Part —
         Ger I — Abstr I —

   Inf —
  Sub — Opt —
    Ger II — Abstr II —
  Pt —
  PPt —
  Ipv —

Since TB has a Kausativum I with a present of Class IXb, the TA present most likely also goes back to an *sk*-present.

SEM. The inchoative meaning 'sich trösten, Mut fassen' is set up according to Zimmer, 1996, 119, fn. 19 (WTG, 305; TEB II, 261 give a stative meaning 'getrost sein').

***tsālt*[B]-** 'kauen', 'chew' (?) (—)
   Prs VI — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part *tsaltanamane*
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub V — Opt —
     Ger II *tsāltalye* Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt I in
   PPt in *tsatsaltarmeṃ* (MQ)
   Ipv —

The subjunctive seems to have persistent initial accent. The juncture *trāskalye ... tsāltalye* in H 149.X.5 a 6/b 1 is the equivalent of Skt. *khādanīyabhojanīya*-'feste und weiche Speise'; see Couvreur, 1954a, 46; the *m*-Part in H 150.50 b 4 is without context.

~ [A]***tsālt*[B]-** '± verschlingen', '± devour' (itr) (m/-/-)
   Prs ? (m) —;-,-, *śalcantär* Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —

According to Winter, 1976a, 29 = 2005, 165, the hapax 3.pl.mid. Prs TA *śalcanträ* in A 55 b 1 belongs to the otherwise unattested TA equivalent of this TB root, which makes good sense in this passage: //// (·)räsyo *śalcanträ lepśsā tāpärk* "jetzt werden sie von den xxx verzehrt", TA *lepś* being a term for an unknown animal. Differently Couvreur, 1956, 71: "etwa 'schlagen'". Winter further analyzes the form as a Prs IV, on which see the discussion in chap. Prs III/IV 26.1.1.

^A tsāw- '?' → *tsāp^a-* 'mash, crush'

tsäk- 'pull, take (out, away)' → *^A tsäk^(a)-* 'id.'

tsäk- act. 'verbrennen', 'burn (something)', mid. 'brennen', 'burn'
>   (tr/itr) (x/m/x)
>   Prs VIII (x) *tsaksau,-, tsakṣäṃ;—* | *tsäksemar,-, tsakṣtär;-,-, tsäksentär*
>>   Imp —
>>   nt-Part —
>>   m-Part *tsäksemane*
>>   Ger I *tsäkṣalle* Abstr I —
>   Sub I — Opt —
>>   Ger II — Abstr II *tsäkalñe* Priv —
>>   Inf *tsaktsi* (tr)
>   Sub III (m) *tskemar,-,-;—* Opt -,-, *tsśītär;-, tsśitär,-*
>>   Ger II *tsäkelle* Abstr II *tskelñe* Priv —
>>   Inf *tsketsi* (itr)
>   Pt III (x) —;-,-, *tsekär* (MQ) | *tseksamai,-,-;—*
>   PPt *tsetsekuwa* | in *tsetsekor*
>   Ipv —

A 3.pl.act. Prs is probably attested in THT 1193 b 7 (apparently an MQ text): *nraiṣṣeṃ tallanṯaṃ tsaksen-[m]e pwār=empe[l](y)[i] ////* (differently Tamai, 2007a, s.v.) "terrible fires burn the poor [denizens] of hell". According to Schmidt, 1974, 20, fn. 3, the 3.pl.mid. Prs *tsaksentär* in 567 a 2, the *m*-Part *tsaksemane* in 154 b 4, H 149.add 116 b 1, and H 149.342 b 4, and the 3.pl.mid. Imp *tsakṣīyentär-ne* in H 149.323 a 2 belong to *tsāk-* 'burn'. The Abstr *tsäkalñe* is attested in Gn 6 (= PK NS 11) a 5 and PK NS 566 a 2 (cf. Broomhead II, 275; without translation), and maybe also in Fill. P 1 b 1 (to be read instead of *tmäkelñe*, cf. Sieg, 1955, 68 who, however, emends to *tsä<r>kalñe*). The 1.sg.mid. Sub III *tskemar* is found in THT 1681 b 3: *ñkeḵ nraiṣṣana pwārasa tskem(a)[r](̩)* "now I burn in the fires of hell" (the verb is also listed in TEB II, 261 without ref.). The Ger II in Fill. W 12 a 5 has to be read *tsäkelle* (contra Filliozat); WTG, 306 restores here *tsäk(e)lle*, but the ⟨ke⟩ is indeed still visible on the facsimile. The 1.sg.mid. Pt *tseksamai* is attested in PK AS 16.7 b [recte a] 6 (unpublished, the passage is quoted by Couvreur, 1954, 89, confirmed by G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). There is some debate about the 3.pl.act. Imp *tsäkṣyeñ-c* in 231 a 5 and the obl. PPt *tsetse(koṣ)* in 369 a 5, which morphologically look like regular forms of this root, but Couvreur, 1954, 89 and 1954c, 110 analyzed both forms as belonging to a cognate of *^A tsäk^(a)-* 'pull (out)', and he is followed by Hackstein, 1995, 140, with fn. 120, who also points out that *tsäkṣyeñ-c* should be rather compared with the Inf *tsantsi* 'to flay' "das etymologisch kaum von B /tsək-1/ ['ab-, herausziehen'] zu trennen ist", but he leaves the details open (see s.v. *^A tsäk^(a)-* 'pull' and *tsäṅk-* 'flay'). The PPt *tsetse(koṣ)* in 369 a 5 is even less clear semantically: *ce aṣañika purpar ñake tsetse(koṣ) śiktālyemeṃ war.* Hackstein, l.c., translates: "Ehrwürdiger, nimm jetzt dieses

aus dem Samen gezogene Wasser entgegen", and in fn. 121 refers to a similar TA juncture TA *tsuk- wär* "Wasser ziehen, trinken", ^A^*tsuk-* being a cognate of ^A^*tsäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pull (out)'. Adams, DoT, 733, on the other hand, relates the PPt with *śiktālymeṃ* and translates "water from the boiled seed". The fem.pl. PPt *tsetsekuwa* in H 149. 168 a 1 is without context and remains unclear; at least the verbal substantive *tsetsekor* in U 17 a 3 as equivalent of Skt. *vaiklavārtha-* 'grievance' does arguably belong to this root.

= ^A^**tsäk-** act. 'verbrennen', 'burn (something)', mid. 'brennen', 'burn'
(tr/itr) (x/-/m)

Prs VIII (a) -,-, *tskäṣ;-,-, tsäkse* Imp —
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I — Abstr I —
Inf *tskässi*

Prs X (m) *tsäknäsmār,-, tsäknäṣtär;-,-, tskämṣantär*
Imp —;-,-, *tskämṣānt*
nt-Part —
m-Part *tsäknäsmāṃ*
Ger I — Abstr I —
Inf —

Sub III — Opt —
Ger II — Abstr II *tskalune*

Pt 0 (m) -,-, *tsakät;—*

PPt *tsatsku*

Ipv —

The 3.sg. Prs TA *tskäṣ* in the fragmentary passage A 324 b 1 rather belongs here and not to ^A^*tsäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pull (out)' for morphological reasons (cf. TG, 482), though this cannot be proven by the context. Sᴇᴍ. Active forms are transitive, middle forms are intransitive (see the examples in Hackstein, 1995, 90f.). As for non-finite forms, the valency is determined by the stem formation: the Inf of the subjunctive stem of Class II has transitive, the Inf of the subjunctive stem of Class III intransitive meaning. The same seems to be true for the respective abstracts. Whereas *tskelñe* from the subjunctive stem of Class III refers to the 'glowing' of the horizon (= Skt. *diśodāghā-*; see Thomas, 1974, 83), *tsäkalñe* from the subjunctive stem of Class II refers to an illness (if correctly read in Fill. P 1 b 1, cf. Adams, DoT, 733: 'fever'). The Ger II *tsäkelle* (sic; see above) in Fill. W 12 a 5 is unclear, the Ger I *tsäkṣalle* in Fill. W 32 b 3f. is ambiguous (*tsäkṣalle saṃtkentampa* "mit den Heilmitteln [zusammen ist es] zu verbrennen", Sieg, 1955, 76). The *m*-Part has, as far as this is determinable, intransitive meaning (in H 149.26/30 a 4; K 12 b 1; 154 = H 149.22 b 4; H 149.add 116 b 1; H 149.342 b 4 is without context). In TA the causative alternation is denoted by voice alternation linked with stem formation. Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from PIE *√dʰegᵘʰ 'mit Feuer behandeln, verbrennen' (²LIV, 133f.; Hackstein, 1995, 91; Adams, DoT, 733).

Atsäk⁽ᵃ⁾- '(heraus-, ab-, ent)ziehen', 'pull, take (out, away)' (tr) (x/m/x)

    Prs VI (x) -, *tsäknāt,-;* — | -,-, *tsäknātär;-,-, tsäknāntär* Imp —;-,-, *śākant*
        nt-Part —
        m-Part *tsäknāmāṃ*
        Ger I *tsäknāl* Abstr I —
        Inf *tsäknātsi*
    Sub V (m) *tskāmār,-,-;* — Opt -, *tskitār,-;* —
        Ger II *tskāl* Abstr II *tskālune*
    Pt I (x) —;-,-, *tsakar* | -,-, *tskāt;-,-, tskānt*
    PPt *tsko*
    Ipv I (m) -; *pätskāc*

Whether TA *tskānt* in the fragmentary passage A 314 b 2 belongs to this root is uncertain. On the passage see s.v. *Akäs-* 'come to extinction'.

KAUSATIVUM III 'entziehen', 'take away' (tr) (—)

    Prs VIII — Imp —
        nt-Part *tsäkṣant*
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II —
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

SEM. See Hackstein, 1995, 141f. in detail, and Thomas, 1993, 208, fn. 158. There is no noticeable semantic difference between grundverb and kausativum.
ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√deu̯k 'ziehen' (²LIV, 124; Hackstein, 1995, 142f.).

In contrast to the manuals, Couvreur, 1954, 89 and 1954c, 110, followed by Hackstein, 1995, 140, analyzes the TB 3.pl.act. Imp *tsäkṣyeñ-c* in 231 a 5 and the obl. PPt *tsetse(koṣ)* in 369 a 5 as belonging to a TB cognate of this root, i.e., to an antigrundverb with Prs VIII and Pt III of a TB root *tsäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pull (out)', which would, however, be totally homonymous with *tsäk-* 'burn'. See the discussion of the forms s.v. *tsäk-* 'burn' and *tsäṅk-* 'flay'.

tsäṅk- '(Haut) abziehen', 'flay' (tr) (—)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub I — Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf *tsantsi*
    Pt —
    PPt —
    Ipv —

Assured hapax in S 8 a 3: *yetse tsańtsi kektseñmeṃ* "to flay the skin from the
body". The stem formation is athematic; see the discussion in chap. Sub I/V
18.1.2.2. Hackstein, 1995, 140 with fn. 119, further points out the parallelism
between this Inf and the 3.pl. Imp *tsäkṣyeñ-c* in 231 a 5 that is analyzed as
regular form of *tsäk-* 'burn' by the manuals (see above s.v.): *yetse tsäkṣyeñ-c
kektseñmeṃ* "they burned away your skin from the body". Hackstein rather
follows Couvreur, 1954, 89, who related this form with ᴬ*tsäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pull', and
Hackstein further claims that both *tsäṅk-* 'flay' and *tsäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pull' ("abziehen,
herausziehen") are etymologically related, but he leaves the details open. To
be sure, if one accepts a writing error, the 3.pl. *tsäkṣyeñ-c* may also stand for
tsä<ṅ>kṣyeñ-c in the first place (note that a cluster *-ṅkC-* is otherwise never
simplified to *-kC-*, only the opposite, i.e., simplification to *-ṅC-* in a cluster
-ṅkC- is common).

~ ᴬ*tspäṅk-* '(Haut) abziehen', 'flay' (tr) (—)

       Prs VIII — Imp —

           nt-Part —

           m-Part —

           Ger I — Abstr I —

           Inf *tspäṅkässi*

       Sub — Opt —

           Ger II — Abstr II —

       Pt II in

       PPt *śaśpäṅku*

       Ipv —

tsäṅkᵃ- 'sich erheben, aufstehen, entstehen', '(a)rise' (itr) (m/a/a)

       Prs III (m) -,-, *tseṅketär;-,-, tseṅkentär*

           Imp -,-, *tseṅkītär;-,-, tseṅkīyentär*

           nt-Part —

           m-Part *tseṅkemane*

           Ger I — Abstr I —

       Sub V (a) *tsāṅkau* (MQ),-, *tsāṅkaṃ;-,-, tsaṅkaṃ*

           Opt -,-, *tsaṅkoy;-,-, tsäṅkon-me* (sic)

           Ger II *tsäṅkälle* (MQ)/*tsaṅkälyai* (MQ)/

           tsäṅkälyi (MQ)/*tsaṅkalyana*

           Abstr II *tsaṅkalñe* (sic) Priv —

           Inf *tsaṅkatsi* (sic)

       Pt I (a) -, *tsäṅkāsta, tsaṅka;* —

       PPt *tsäṅkau/tsäṅkowä* (MQ)/*tsäṅkowwa* (MQ) | *tsäṅkoṣ*

       Ipv —

The 1.sg. Sub *tsāṅkau* is also attested in THT 3597 a 1 (MQ) and the 3.pl. Sub
tsäṅkaṃ also in THT 1191 b 7 (MQ); the 3.pl. Opt *tsäṅkon-me* is found in PK
NS 48 + 258 a 5 (DA) (Pinault, 1994, 185); the 3.sg. Sub *tsäṅkaṃ* is attested
quite often. Quite obviously, the subjunctive stem shows ablaut and persistent
initial accent except in the 3.pl. Opt *tsäṅkon-me*. The Ger II forms *tsaṅkälyai*

and *tsäṅkälyi* with irregular stem vowel are both found in the MQ text 552, which shows a lot of erroneous spellings; the regular fem.pl. *tsaṅkalyana* comes from the Murtuq text THT 1265 a 1. The Inf *tsaṅkatsi* is also attested in SHT 7, 1738 (reading: K. T. Schmidt), and in the MQ text THT 1472 frg. a b 2. Instead of a middle preterit *tsäṅkāte* one has to separate *tsäṅkā te* in 341 b 2 (MQ), as per Schmidt, 1974, 46, fn. 2. Another attestation of the 3.sg.act. Pt is now to be found in the small fragments IOL Toch 708 b 2 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.) and in THT 1470 a 3 (Qu): *tsäṅkā-ne •* (a reading †*tsäṅkāte* is excluded, cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v.). An isolated 3.pl. Pt *tsäṅkare* (MQ) seems further attested in THT 1859 b [recte a] 1. The PPt variant *tsäṅkowä* is found in the small MQ text THT 1237 b 2 (archaic ductus, metrical). Instead of a kausativum *(tsä)ṅkṣalle* from this root (thus WTG, 306, etc.), one has to restore *(rä)ṅkṣalle* in H 149.333 a 4, according to Thomas, 1987, 177, but either restoration is uncertain. Eᴛʏᴍ. Traditionally derived from PIE *√dʰengʰ 'erreichen' (IEW, 250) (cf. Adams, DoT, 734 with ref.); ²LIV does not set up this root any longer, the respective verbal forms are derived from a root PIE *√dʰegʷʰh₂ (p. 134f.) with nasal present *dʰgʷʰ-ne-h₂/-n̥-h₂-. For the remarkable root ablaut, see chap. Prs III/IV 26.1.4.1.

ᴬ**tsän**ᵃ- 'zusammensetzen, zusammenfügen', 'compose' (?) (-/m/-)

    Prs — Imp —
        nt-Part —
        m-Part —
        Ger I — Abstr I —
        Inf —
    Sub V (m) —;-,-, *tsnāntr-äṃ* Opt —
        Ger II — Abstr II *tsnālune*
        Inf —
    Pt I in
    PPt *tsno*
    Ipv —

The unpublished fragment where contextless TA *tsnāntr-äṃ* is attested (as per TG, 482) is THT 1151 b 2. An Abstr TA *tsnālune* is probably attested without context in the small fragment THT 2398 b 4, cf. Tamai, 2007a, s.v. Since Sub V and Abstr II are far more common than Prs V and Abstr I, I set up a Sub V for these otherwise contextless forms. Sᴇᴍ./Eᴛʏᴍ. For the semantics, I follow Seržant, 2007, 105ff., who connects the root with the PIE nasal present stem *du-n-h₂- from *√deu̯h₂ 'zusammenfügen' (²LIV, 123), i.e., the same PIE root that underlies ᴬᴮ*tsuw⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'attach'.

ᴬ**tsäp-** → ᴬ*tsäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'increase'

tsäm⁽ᵃ⁾- 'wachsen, entstehen', 'grow, increase, come into being' (itr) (m/m/a)

    Prs III (m) -,-, *tsmetär;-,-, tsmentär* Imp —
        nt-Part —

        m-Part *tsmemane*
        Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub V (m) —;-,-, *tsmāntär* Opt -,-, *tsmoytär-ñ;-,-, tsmoyemtär-ne*
         Ger II — Abstr II *tsmālñe* Priv —
         Inf *tsmātsi*
   Pt I (a) -,-, *tsama;* —
   PPt *tsmauwa* | *tsämoṣ*
   Ipv —

Instead of an active 3.sg. Opt *tsamoy*, one has to read *tsamo yṣuwarsa prekṣäṃ* "befragt sehr (?) freundlich" in the letter 492 a 1, according to Couvreur, 1957, 47 (Thomas, 1985, 90 interprets *yṣuwarsa* as a substantive by the meaning "mit Nachdruck"; see also Pinault, 1995, 193f.). The existence of an active subjunctive form *tsāmat* (thus WTG, 307; TEB II, 262) gained from the complex *[au]katsāmatra* in 516 b 4 is very uncertain, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 48f., fn. 3. For Krause/Thomas this word separation was acceptable, because they analyzed preceding *[au]kat* as a synonymic verbal form 'let grow', but note that the root *auk-*, in fact, does not mean 'grow' at all; see s.v. *auk-* '± set in motion'. Such an active subjunctive form would, moreover, be irregular in such a kind of paradigm. The 3.sg.mid. Opt *tsmoytär-ñ* is also found in THT 1609 b 4. The Inf *tsmātsi* (also listed in TEB I, 229, § 412,2 without ref.) is attested in the small fragment THT 1509 b 1: *tsmātsi-śco* •. A PPt *tsmauwa* is said to be attested by Couvreur, 1954, 88 (without ref.), the PPt *tsämoṣ* occurs in PK AS 16.2 b 2 (Pinault, 1989a, 155).

ANTIGRUNDVERB 'vermehren, vergrößern, entstehen/wachsen lassen, fördern',
       'cause to grow, increase, promote' (tr) (a/m/a)
      Prs VIII (a) -, *tsamṣt, tsämṣäṃ* (MQ);-,-, *tsämsen-ne* Imp —
         nt-Part *tsämṣeñca*
         m-Part —
         Ger I *tsämṣalle* Abstr I —
      Sub I/II (m) -,-, *tsāmtär/tsāmtär-ne* (sic); — Opt —
         Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
         Inf *tsamtsi/tsämtsi* (MQ)
      Pt III (a) -,-, *tsemtsa;* —
      PPt *tsetsamu*
      Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. Sub *tsāmtär* is attested in PK NS 54 a 1: *kos kos̱ tsāmtra yāmornta bodhisātve wakīceṃ ṯaryā-yäkne* • (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; the verbal form was already quoted by Couvreur, 1954, 86, and see also the translation by Schmidt, 1974, 470: "Sooft ein Bodhisattva die dreifach ausgezeichneten Taten fördert", followed by Carling, 2003b, 69). Another 3.sg.mid. Sub *tsāmtär-ne* is attested in the same text in line a 2: *kos̱ tsāmṯar-ne krentau(na)* ////. On the Sub class, see chap. Sub II 19.1.4. The PPt *tsetsamu* is only listed in TEB II, 262 without ref.

= ᴬ*tsäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'wachsen, einstehen', 'grow, increase, come into being' (itr) (m/-/-)

   Prs III (m) —;-,-, *śamantär* Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub V — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II *tsmālune*
   Pt I in
   PPt *tsmo*
   Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. Prs TA *śamatär* listed in TEB I, 175, § 298,2 is probably only reconstructed. Winter, 1980b, 561 = 1984, 254 = 2005, 248 (without ref.) lists a TA form *śmā-m* with the translation "es wuchs uns". Such a form can only be found in A 278 b 2, where the manuals analyze it as a preterit of ᴬ*ṣtäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'stand' (see, most recently, Pinault, 1994c, 389f.). Although there now exists an Old Turkish parallel version for the text A 278, the exact meaning of the Toch. passage remains uncertain, and a meaning 'grew' can therefore not be backed up with certainty (see the discussion of passage A 278 b 2 s.v. ᴬ*ṣtārᵃ?-* 'become tired'); hence, I do not set up a preterit stem *śäm-*, the more since there was certainly a TA *śämā-* acting as the regular preterit stem of ᴬ*ṣtäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'stand', and we would be facing two homonymous preterit stems. In the unpublished small fragment THT 1650 frg. b b 3 (no photograph at TITUS) one can read a contextless Ger II TA *śmāṣḷạn* that either belongs to a Sub IX from a root ᴬ*śäm⁽ᵃ⁾-* or to a palatalized Sub IX stem of this root or of the root ᴬ*ṣtäm⁽ᵃ⁾-*. The PPt TA *tspont* in A 254 a 5 is certainly only a scribal error for correct TA *tsmont*, as assumed by TG, 482 s.v. *tsäp-*.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'vermehren, einstehen/wachsen lassen', 'increase, cause to grow' (tr) (a/-/m)

   Prs VIII (a) -,-, *tsmäṣ*,— Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub IX — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II *tsmāṣlune*
   Pt II (m) —;-,-, *śaśmānt*
   PPt —
   Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs TA *tsämseñc* listed in TEB I, 175, § 298,2 is probably only reconstructed.

Sᴇᴍ. For the variety of meaning, see Winter, 1962a, 26f. = 1984, 268f. = 2005, 56f., who set up the basic meaning as 'im Zustand allmählichen Entstehens sein'. Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from the root set up as PIE *√demh₂ '(zusammen)fügen, bauen' by ²LIV, 114ff., according to Winter, 1962a, 25ff. =

1984, 267ff. = 2005, 55ff., followed by Hackstein, 1995, 138ff.; objections by Ringe, 1991, 109. Hackstein, l.c., derives the subjunctive stem directly from the PIE thematic present, so he analyzes the (ambiguous) Toch. subjunctive as one of Class II (claiming the -ā- was taken over from a Sub V allomorph *tsāmā-). On the root ablaut, see most recently Nikolaev, 2005, 68ff.

***tsär*⁽ᵃ⁾-** 'getrennt sein', 'be separated' (itr) (m/-/a)

> Prs III (m) *tsremar, tsetar* (sic), *tsretär;-,-, tsrentär-me* Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I *tsrelle* Abstr I *tsrelñe*
> Sub V — Opt —
>> Ger II *tsrälle* Abstr II *tsrälñe* Priv —
>> Inf *tsrātsi*
> Pt I (a) *tsrāwa,-,-;* —
> PPt in *tsrorsa*
> Ipv —

The 3.pl.mid. Prs *tsrentär-me* is arguably attested in the small fragment THT 2378 frg. g a 2 and the Inf *tsr[ā]tsi* in THT 3596 b 2 (sentence-finally without further context); the 1.sg. Pt *tsrāwa* is found in PK NS 31 a 3 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c., also listed in TEB II, 262 without ref.). The PPt *tsrau* listed in TEB I, 239, § 431,3 is probably only reconstructed on account of the attested verbal noun.

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'trennen', 'separate' (tr) (m/-/a)

> Prs IXb (m) -,-, *tsarästär;*— Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
> Sub IXb — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
>> Inf *tsarstsi*
> Pt II (a) -, *tsyārasta, tsyāra;*—
> PPt in *tsetstsarormeṃ*
> Ipv —

The Inf *tsarstsi* (with irregular loss of *ä in a closed syllable) seems attested in IOL Toch 902 b 1 without context (cf. Tamai, 2007, s.v.).

= ᴬ***tsär*⁽ᵃ⁾-** 'getrennt sein', 'be separated' (itr) (-/m/a)

> Prs III — Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part —
>> Ger I in *śralṣi* Abstr I *śralune*
>> Inf —
> Sub V (m) -,-, *tsratär* (sic);— Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II *tsrālune*
> Pt I (a) —; *tsaramäs,-,-*
> PPt *tsro*

Ipv —

The analysis given here is quite different from that given in the manuals. TA *tsaramäs* in A 347 a 2 is neither present nor subjunctive (thus TG, 483), but preterit with regular full vowel in the plural stem, cf. Schmidt, 1974, 50f.; 1975, 291f. The palatalized non-finite forms TA *śralune* 'separation, being in a state of separation' and the Ger TA *śral* are usually analyzed as formations based on the subjunctive stem of Class III, but in the YQ manuscript there is now the expected, regular Abstr TA *tsrālune* 'separation, being in a state of separation' attested (YQ 29 a 8), which is formed to a subjunctive of Class V. TA *śralune* is consequently to be derived from a present stem of Class III. As for the gerundive TA *śral* "trennbar" to be found in some manuals (e.g., ²LIV, 119), such a form does not exist, there is only the adjective TA *śralṣi* coming from the very fragmentary passage A 180 a 4: //// *k snākyāṃ śralṣī(nāṃ?) kl[o]* //// "... sole, to separate, pai(nful ?) ...". TA *śralṣi* is to be derived from a substantivized (!) gerundive *śral. Finally, TA *tsratär* may formally look like a present of Class III (thus Schmidt, 1974, 49), but in the passage A 146 b 4 the form should be analyzed as subjunctive, which is what TG, 438 did, because it is coordinated with another subjunctive: *lapā klāṣ-äṃ tsratr-änn oki puk kapśañ(i)* ------ *mā säm tmaṃ wärsäṣ mā wāsä(ṅkatä)r* "er (= der Embryo) wird ihn (= ?) auf dem Kopf tragen [und] der ganze Körper gleichsam getrennt sein von ihm (= ?) ... nicht atmet er dabei, nicht bewegt er sich" (cf. the translation by Schmidt, 1974, 277 and Carling, 2000, 195; but for TA *klāṣ-äṃ* see s.v. ᴬ*klāwᵃ*- 'fall'). The most plausible assumption is that we are dealing with a scribal error for TA †*tsrātär* (on the paradigm, see Malzahn, 2009, 63ff.).

Kᴀᴜsᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'trennen', 'separate' (tr) (-/-/a)

> Prs VIII — Imp —
>> nt-Part —
>> m-Part *tsräsmāṃ*
>> Ger I — Abstr I —
>> Inf *tsrässi*
> Sub — Opt —
>> Ger II — Abstr II —
> Pt II (a) -, *śaśrāṣt,-*; —
> PPt —
> Ipv —

Sᴇᴍ. Pace Krause/Thomas (WTG, 307; TEB II, 159 and 262), Adams, DoT, 736 correctly assumes that the grundverb does not have reflexive meaning ('sich trennen'), but an intransitive-stative one 'being in a state of separation' (a passive meaning "getrennt werden" — which is what Schmidt, 1974, 49, fn. 2 following TochSprR(B), glossary, 193 translated — is also incorrect). Eᴛʏᴍ. To be derived from PIE *√*der* 'zerreißen (intr.), zerspringen' (²LIV, 119f.); see most recently Malzahn, 2009, 63ff.

tsärk- 'erhitzen, verbrennen; quälen', 'heat, burn; torture' (tr) (a/-/-)

        Prs IXa (a) -,-, *tsärkaṣṣäṃ*;-,-, *tsärkaskeṃ* Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

        Sub I — Opt —

            Ger II *tsärkalle* Abstr II *tsärkalñe* Priv —

            Inf —

        Sub II — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II *tsärśalñe* Priv —

            Inf —

        Pt III in

        PPt *tsetsarkoṣ*

        Ipv —

The manuals also list a Prs VI stem from this root being part of a grundverb paradigm of a — subsequently — triple root: Gv. Prs VI, Kaus. 1 *Prs VIII–Sub II–Pt III, Kaus. 2 Prs IXb (cf. TEB I, 208f., § 376 and TEB II, 262). It is true that the Prs VI forms in question may have the same meaning as the forms listed here, but since they are based on a stem **tsārkā-* (and are likewise transitive, i.e., do not constitute an intransitive grundverb), I set up two synchronically different roots, even though both roots are no doubt diachronically related (see above s.v. *tsärk^a-*). In addition, the manuals set up a (transitive) grundverb subjunctive of Class V (TEB II, 262), which would be expected beside a Prs VI stem; however, none of the attested subjunctive stem formations does show a suffix vowel *-ā-*, and, what is more, the MQ attestations show *-ä-*, which can only belong to a subjunctive stem of Class I, as per Adams, DoT, 736f. In addition, *tsärśalñe* is certainly a thematic form of Class II (note that TA also has a subjunctive stem of Class II). Both Prs forms may come from MQ texts, but since the two respective manuscripts do not show otherwise any "MQ character" at all, it is obvious that we have to do with Prs IXa and not Prs IXb forms (pace the manuals).

= ^A***tsärk-*** 'verbrennen; quälen', 'burn; torture' (tr) (—)

        Prs — Imp —

            nt-Part —

            m-Part —

            Ger I — Abstr I —

            Inf —

        Sub II — Opt —

            Ger II — Abstr II *tsärślune*

        Pt —

        PPt —

        Ipv —

tsälp^(a)- 'hinübergehen, erlöst werden', 'pass away, be released, be redeemed' (itr) (m/m/a)

        Prs III (m) *tsalpemar*,-, *tsälpetär*;-,-, *tsälpentär*

Imp -,-, *tsälpitär;-,-, tsälpiyentär*
nt-Part —
m-Part —
Ger I *tsälpelye* Abstr I *tsälpelñe*
Sub V (m) -,-, *tsälpātär* (MQ); — Opt *tsälpoymar,-, tsälpoytär;*
    -,-, *tsälpoyntar* (sic)/*tsälpontär*
    Ger II — Abstr II *tsälpālñe* Priv —
    Inf *tsälpātsi*
Pt I (a) *tsälpāwa, tsälpāsta, tsalpa;-,-, tsälpāre*
PPt *tsälpau/tsälpowo | tsälpoṣ/tsälpoṣo*
Ipv —

A 1.sg.mid. Prs *tsalpemar* is only listed in TEB I, 211, § 380,1a without ref.;
similarly, the 3.sg.mid. Imp *tsälpitär* is only listed in TEB II, 262 without ref.
and both forms are probably only reconstructed; in addition, Krause, 1950, 31
cites a 3.sg. active Imp *tsälpi* without ref. (not mentioned anymore in WTG). A
3.pl.mid. Imp *tsä(lpiyentär)* can be restored in KVāc 17 a 1 (as per Schmidt,
1986, 16, fn. 41). The 1.sg.mid. Opt *tsälpoyma(r)* is also attested in THT 1235 a
2, the 3.sg.mid. Opt *tsälpoyträ* (beside the hypercorrect form *tsälpauyträ* in
295 b 4) in THT 3198 a 1, and the 3.pl.mid. Opt also in THT 1179 frg. a a 6:
(wno)lmi la̱[k](l)entameṃ tsạlpont[ra] (differently Tamai, 2007a, s.v.) "the
beings should be released from sufferings". The 3.sg. Pt *tsalpa* is found in PK
NS 54 b 6: //// *[pr]ākre eṅsate ot mā tsalpa •* (unpublished, reading according
to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The Ipv I form listed by the manuals is to be analyzed as
Ipv II.

KAUSATIVUM I 'erlösen, befreien', 'redeem, free' (tr) (x/m/m)
    Prs IXb (x) *tsalpäskau,-, tsalpäṣṣäṃ; — | -,-, tsalpästär;* — Imp —
        nt-Part *tsälpäṣṣeñca* (MQ)
        m-Part *tsalpäskemane*
        Ger I — Abstr I —
    Sub IXb (m) — Opt *tsälpaṣṣimar* (MQ),-,-; —
        Ger II *tsalpäṣle* Abstr II — Priv —
        Inf *tsalpästsi/tsälpastsī* (MQ)
    Pt II (m) -, *tsyālpatai, tsyālpāte* (Š)/*tsyalpāte* (sic); —
    PPt —
    Ipv II (m) *pätsilpar-ñ;-*
    Ipv IV (m) *tsalpäṣṣar-me;-*

The 1.sg. Prs *tsalpäskau* is only listed in TEB I, 211, § 380,1a, the 3.sg.
tsalpäṣṣäṃ only in TEB I, 212, § 382, and the 3.sg.mid. *tsalpästär* only in TEB I,
174, § 297,1 without ref.; it is possible to restore such a 3.sg.mid. *(tsa)lpastar*
in the small fragment THT 1396 frg. a a 2. The m-Part *tsa(lpäs)[k](e)mane* is
attested in PK NS 38 + 37 b 1 (Pinault, 1988a, 194); the 3.sg. form *tsyālpāte* in
the Šorčuq text 30 b 5 is most likely due to copying from an MQ text, and the
variant *tsyalpāte* may come from an MQ manuscript itself (H 150.104 b 3); see
also chap. Pt II 8.1.4. The Inf *tsalpästsi* is now also attested in the non-MQ text
PK AS 7M a 2 (G.-J. Pinault, p.c.). The transitive Ipv *pätsilpar-ñ* has to be
analyzed as an Ipv II form; see the discussion in chap. Ipv 37.2.

= ᴬ*tsälp⁽ᵃ⁾*- 'hinübergehen, erlöst werden', 'pass away, be released, be
      redeemed' (itr) (m/a/a)
          Prs III (m) -,-, *śalpatär*;-,-, *śalpantär* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part *śalpmāṃ*
                Ger I *śalpal* Abstr I —
                Inf *śalpatsi*
          Sub V (a) -,-, *tsalpaṣ*;-, *tsälpāc, tsälpeñc*
                Opt -,-, *tsälpi; tsälpimäs*,-, *tsälpiñc*
                Ger II — Abstr II *tsälpālune*
          Pt I (a) -,-, *tsälp*;-, *tsalpas, tsalpar*
          PPt *tsälpo*
          Ipv —

The 1.sg.mid. Prs TA *śalpmār* listed in TEB I, 211, § 380,1a is probably only
reconstructed. The 3.sg. Opt TA *(tsälp)i-ñi* is to be restored with certainty in A
258 b 6; see Geng/Laut/Pinault, 2004a, 74.

Kᴀᴜꜱᴀᴛɪᴠᴜᴍ I 'erlösen, befreien', 'redeem, free' (tr) (m+/m/-)
          Prs VIII (m+) -,-, *tsälpäṣtär*;— Imp —
                nt-Part *tsälpṣant*
                m-Part *tsälpäsmāṃ*
                Ger I *tsälpäṣlye* Abstr I —
                Inf —
          Sub IX (m) — Opt -, *tsälpāṣitār*,-;—
                Ger II — Abstr II —
          Pt II in
          PPt *śaśälpu*
          Ipv —

Eᴛʏᴍ. According to Adams, DoT, 738, perhaps to be derived from PIE *√dʰelbʰ
'graben, aushöhlen' (²LIV, 143) with the semantic development 'dig (out)' →
'excavate' → 'extricate' → 'free'. As for the ē-grade in TA *śalpatär*, see chap. Prs
III/IV.

tsik⁽ᵃ⁾- 'formen, bilden', 'form, shape' (tr) (-/a/m)
          Prs I — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *tsikale* (sic) Abstr I —
          Sub V (a) -,-, *tsaikaṃ*;— Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
          Pt I (m) -, *tsaikatai* (sic),-;-,-, *tsaikānte*
          PPt *tsatsaikau* | *tsatsaikaṣ*
          Ipv —

The present class is a matter of discussion. The sole attestation, the Ger I
tsikale, is attested twice in Fill. M 2 a 3 and a 6 (the reading can be confirmed).
The manuals (WTG, 308; TEB II, 262; Adams, DoT, 738) set up Prs V;

differently, Winter, 1962a, 23 = 1984, 265 = 2005, 53 proposed a Prs VII
*tsiṅkale with omission of the nasal (objections against Prs VII are raised by
Hackstein, 1995, 36, fn. 57); Klingenschmitt, 1982, 183, fn. 24 reckons with an
athematic root present (Prs I). There can indeed be put forth parallels for the
pairing of a zero-grade present of Class I or V with a full-vowel Sub V/Pt I
stem; see also the discussion in chap.s Prs I 24.2. and Prs V 27.1.1. Taking the
gerundive at face value, Prs I is maybe the most probable analysis after all.
Instead of a 3.pl. Opt *tsaikoṃ* (thus WTG, 308), one has to read and restore a
PPt *(t)[s](a)tsaik[au]* in H 149.168 (= IOL Toch 37) b 1, as per Peyrot, 2007, s.v.
The 2.sg.mid. Pt *tsaikatai* is attested in the graffito Qu 34 (Pinault, 1994a, 175
and 180; 2000a, 157), the 3.pl.mid. Pt *tsaikānte* in PK AS 16.3 a 6 (Couvreur,
1954, 88; Pinault, 1989a, 156), and the PPt *tsatsaikaṣ* in 204 b 2.

= *^A tsik^B?-* 'formen, bilden', 'form, shape' (tr) (—)

      Prs — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf —
      Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt I in
      PPt *tsātseku*
      Ipv —

ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√dʰeiĝʰ 'bestreichen, kneten' (²LIV, 140f.;
Adams, DoT, 738f.). The concrete meaning 'form clay' is still attested in the
Sub *tsaikaṃ* in 3 a 2, and in the compound *lwaksā-tsaika* 'potter' ~ TA *kuntis-
tsek* 'id.'.

tsit^B?- 'berühren', 'touch' (tr) (-/-/a)

      Prs — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
      Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf —
      Pt I (a) -,-, *tsītā-ne*; —
      PP —
      Ipv —

The 3.sg. Pt *tsītā-ne* is attested in PK AS 7M b 4 (unpublished, reading
according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.).

= *^A tsit^(a)-* 'berühren', 'touch' (tr) (a/a/a)

      Prs VI (a) *tsinām*,-,-; — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —

Inf *tsinātsi*
Sub V (a) — Opt *tsitim,-,-;—*
          Ger II — Abstr II *tsitālune*
Pt I (a) -,-, *tsit/tsitā-ṃ;—*
PPt *tsito*
Ipv —

The 3.sg. Pt TA *tsit* in A 9 a 1 has been corrected from TA *tsis*; see TochSprR(A), "Verbesserungen und Nachträge", ad p. 8. Whether one can restore an Ipv of this root in A 158 b 6 — either TA *ptsetā(-m)* or TA *ptsetā(-ñi)* as proposed by TG, 484 — or a middle TA *ptsetā(r)* (as preferred by W. Siegling, pers. copy) remains uncertain because of the difference in root ablaut (this sentence-initial form is without further context).

KAUSATIVUM IV 'berühren lassen', 'make touch' (tr) (—)
Prs VIII — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part *tsitäsmāṃ*
          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf —
Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The kausativum TA *tsitäsmāṃ* 'making touch' is attested in YQ 5 b 7 and YQ 29 a 6 (on the meaning of TA *āntac tsit-* in this passages, see Carling, 2000, 88f.).

tsip²- 'tanzen', 'dance' (itr) (a+/-/-)
Prs I + II (a+) -,-, *tsipäṃ;-,-, tsipeṃ* Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part *tsipamane*
          Ger I *tsipalle* Abstr I —
Sub — Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
          Inf —
Pt —
PPt —
Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs *tsipeṃ* is attested in PK AS 16.8 a 6 (unpublished, reading according to G.-J. Pinault, p.c.; also listed in TEB II, 262 without ref.), the Ger I *tsipa[l](le)* in KVāc 11 a 3 (Schmidt, 1986, 44); on the thematic 3.pl. ending, see chap. Prs I 24.1.2.

= ᴬ*tsip²-* 'tanzen', 'dance' (itr) (a/-/-)
Prs I (a) —;-,-, *tsipiñc* Imp —;-,-, *śepär*
          nt-Part *tsipänt*
          m-Part —

     Ger I — Abstr I —
     Inf —
   Sub — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II —
   Pt —
   PPt —
   Ipv —

The 3.pl. TA *tsi(piñc)* is to be restored in A 193 b 3, according to Thomas, 1958a, 142. Couvreur, 1956, 79 restores *(tse)päntāñ ap(tsaräntu)* "dancing apsaras (nymphs)" in A 444 a 3 (thus already W. Siegling, pers. copy; note that one should better restore TA *(tsi)päntāñ*; for this form and the nomen agentis TA *tsepänt* 'dancer', see chap. Prs Part 36.2.2.).

tsuk⁽ᵃ⁾- '± (aus)saugen', '± suck (out)' (tr) (-/-/a)
   Prs — Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub V — Opt —
     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf *tsaukatsi* (MQ)
   Pt I (a) -,-, *tsaukā-c* (MQ); —
   PPt —
   Ipv —

According to Schmidt, 1997a, 258f., the 3.sg. *tsaukā-c* attested in 250 a 1 is a regular Pt I form (and no emendation necessary as proposed by TochSprR(B), fn. ad 250 a 1, and WTG, 277): *p(a)kenta karstā-c tsaukā-c (yasa)r (s)u* "Er zerschnitt deinen (Scheitel in sieben) Teile [und] sog dein (Blut) aus" — the restoration *(yasa)r*, as already proposed by TochSprR(B), is quite certain. Schmidt, l.c., also mentions an Inf *tsaukatsi* as being attested in an unpublished Berlin text (without ref.), which seems to be THT 1536 frg. g b 2 (MQ): *//// rwe tsaukatsi 1 ////*.

ANTIGRUNDVERB '± säugen; aufziehen', '± suckle; foster' (tr) (a/-/a)
   Prs VIII (a) —;-,-, *tsuksem* Imp —
     nt-Part —
     m-Part —
     Ger I — Abstr I —
   Sub I — Opt —
     Ger II *tsukäle* (sic) Abstr II — Priv —
     Inf —
   Pt III (a) *tsaukwa,-*, *tsoksa-ñ* (sic); —
   PPt —
   Ipv —

The 3.pl. Prs *(tsu)ksem* is restored in 415 a 3 by TochSprR(B) in view of the following 1.sg. Pt: *(tsu)ksem sₐsūwerśke wī pikla ñiś no tsaukwa cī* "they foster/suckle the boy, but for two years I fostered/suckled you". The 3.sg. Pt

tsoksa-ñ in 23 b 7 seems to have some kind of metaphorical notion: *ñäś weñ=erkatte rekaunasa tsoksa-ñ māka*; TochSprR(B), transl., 39 simply translated "mit ärgerlichen Worten tränkte er mich"; Hackstein, 1995, 146 referred to German "'führen' im Sinne von 'anführen'" (i.e., 'pull up' → 'foster' and metaphorically 'tease') and to Lat. *dūcere* 'lead', hence 'lead (into a false or undesirable position)' in accordance with the proposed etymology (see below). However, we may also merely be dealing with a metaphorical use of 'foster' in this passage, which is dealing with Ānanda telling the Buddha how he was rejected and insulted when asking for alms. Hence, the passage may mean: "he fed me with harsh words" (instead of alms). On the other hand, D. Q. Adams points out to me (p.c.) that we may also take *tsoksa* at face value and set up a different root *tsok-* '± berate, castigate, criticize' (see now ²DoT, s.v. *tsok-* '± berate'). The Ger II is obscure. It is attested twice on a wooden tablet from the Berezowsky collection that was first edited by Lévi, 1913, 320, fn. 1 with the signature "T.P.". Krause, WTG refers to the same text by quoting the page of Lévi's edition (hence "Pä 320"): a 3 *purṇāyä ñem śamaśke tsukäle ṣañ tärkāte* (reading according to WTG, 122, fn. 7). Krause translates: "Der Prinz Purṇāya mit Namen wurde ... zum Tränken (?) gelassen" (I do not know why he translates 'prince' rather than 'boy'). In line b 5 of the same text the form is construed with *śamaśkeṃtse*, i.e., the gen.sg. of the same word again, but the rest is even more unclear (it may contain names): *yurpaṣṣe kapär citay śamaśkeṃtse tsukäle*. Hackstein, 1995, 143, fn. 132 and 146 objects to Krause's interpretation ("überzeugt nicht"), though without coming up with an alternative for these difficult passages. No doubt a verb meaning 'suckle' could perfectly well relate to forms of *śamaśke* 'boy', but such a collocation would nevertheless come as a surprise in a caravan travel passport (if the piece is not a letter for another purpose; note that Krause's translation would make some sense if one assumes a situation like "he himself let out the boy by the name P. in order to water (the camels vel sim.)"). Since the original document is unavailable at present time, the passages have to remain unclear.
= ᴬ*tsuk*ᵃ- 'trinken', 'drink' (tr) (-/a/a)

      Prs — Imp —
          nt-Part —
          m-Part —
          Ger I — Abstr I —
          Inf —
      Sub V (a) *tsokam*,-,-;— Opt —
          Ger II — Abstr II —
      Pt I (a) -,-, *śuk*;—
      PPt *tsuko*
      Ipv I (a) *ptsok*;-

ᴬ*yok-* 'drink' provides the suppletive present stem. TA *yoka[t]* in A 96 a 4 is rather not a subjunctive form of this root, i.e., from **tsokat* having undergone influence of the suppletive root ᴬ*yok-* 'drink' (as per TEB I, 230, § 412,6), but belongs to ᴬ*yuk*ᵃ- 'overcome' (see s.v.).

SEM./ETYM. In TA, the root most often takes on TA *wär* 'water' as its object (or is otherwise used absolutely, cf. Hackstein, 1995, 144), and the meaning 'drink' is quite certain. TB is semantically more difficult. There are two alternative etymologies. The traditional etymology is *√dʰeu̯gʰ 'produce (milk)', as per Duchesne-Guillemin (see the ref. in Adams, DoT, 740). Differently, Lane, 1938, 24 proposed PIE *√deu̯k 'ziehen' (²LIV, 124), and he is followed by Hackstein 1995, 145f. and Adams, l.c., for semantic reasons. Hackstein consequently sets up "trinken, wtl. ziehen" for the grundverb forms and for the antigrundverb forms "säugen/ziehen lassen" or "(auf)ziehen" and metaphorically "jem. mit ärgerlichen Worten (auf)ziehen" — in addition, Hackstein, 2003, 186 also refers to TA *tskunteṃ mācar* 'foster mother', now attested in YQ 21 b 6; but see Pinault, 2006, 142f. Adams, most recently in DoT, 740 further interprets TA *tspok* 'taste' as a cognate and even derivative from this root, deriving TA *tsuk-* from PIE "*wi-deuk-" > PT "*wä-tsuk-" > *tspuk-, -p- having been lost before labial -*u*- by sound law (but see the objections by Ringe, 1991, 109, fn. 118). Schmidt, 1997a, 258f., by explicitly differentiating between "Grundverb" and "Kausativ", sets up "(aus)saugen" for the grundverb and "säugen tränken, aufziehen" for what I call antigrundverb. Apart from the question of the etymology and exact meaning of the TB forms, the behavior of this root with respect to forming various different paradigms will constitute a singularity in any case, because antigrundverbs (i.e., a paradigm consisting of Prs VIII, Sub I, and Pt III) otherwise do not take on the semantics of a causative, i.e., Kausativum IV (like 'suck, drink' → 'suckle, give to drink' or 'pull' → 'raise'), nor is there another example of a transitive antigrundverb standing beside a likewise transitive grundverb.

tsuw⁽ᵃ⁾- 'sich fügen zu, zusammen fügen, haften an', 'attach oneself, being
           stuck together, stick to' (itr) (m/-/a)
           Prs III (m) -,-, *tswetär;*-,-, *tswentär* Imp —
                     nt-Part —
                     m-Part —
                     Ger I — Abstr I —
           Sub — Opt —
                     Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                     Inf —
           Pt I (a) -,-, *tsuwa;*-,-, *tswāre*
           PPt *tswau | tswoṣ*
           Ipv —
The 3.pl.mid. Prs *tswenṭrä* can be found in IOL Toch 767 b 1 (Peyrot, 2007, s.v.), and a similar 3.pl.mid. Prs *stwentär* (sic) is probably also attested in THT 1324 frg. b b 1 (Garbhāvakrāntisūtra), if one accepts a misspelling for †*tswentär* (such metatheses of graphemes are indeed sometimes attested). Otherwise one would have to set up a yet unknown root *stuwᵃ-* '?': //// *no mīsa stwentar-me mīsāmeṃ pitke āsta mrest(īwe)* (cf. the reading by Tamai, 2007a, s.v.) "then the flesh sticks to them [and] from the flesh spittle, bone,

[and] marrow ...". Beside the fem.pl. PPt, the nom.sg. PPt is now attested in THT 3598 frg. c b 1: *matsi tsw[au] e* //// "matted hair".

KAUSATIVUM I 'hinzufügen', 'add' (tr) (—)

        Prs IXb — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *tsuwäṣälle/tsuwaṣälle* Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt II in
        PPt *tsetsuwu*
        Ipv —

= *A**tsuw(ä)-* act. 'sich zusammenfügen', 'stick together', mid. 'gehorchen',

        'obey' (itr) (m/-/x)

        Prs V (?) (m) -,-, *tswātär;* — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt I (x) —;-,-, *tsawar| tswe,-, tswāt;-,-, tswānt*
        PPt *tswo*
        Ipv —

The 3.sg.mid. TA *tswātär* in A 71 b 1 is certainly a present, not a subjunctive form and can therefore only be Prs V, unless one wants to assume a misspelling for Prs III †*tswatär*, which is the expected Prs stem formation.

KAUSATIVUM I 'zusammenfügen', 'put together' (tr) (-/a/-)

        Prs — Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub IX (a) *tswāsam,-,-;* — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —

SEM. The middle of the TA grundverb has the figurative meaning 'obey', the active has the concrete meaning 'stick together' (see Schmidt, 1974, 491f.; this is also true for the undiscussed passage A 131 b 3; A 324 b 3 is without clear context). On the other hand, a difference in meaning between active and middle forms in TB cannot be found (pace WTG, 309). ETYM. To be derived from PIE *√deu̯h₂ 'zusammenfügen' (²LIV, 123 with ref.); because of the

intransitive valency, the Pt I rather has a suffix (*)-*ā*- than one developed out
of a root-final laryngeal.

TA *tsetā*- '?' → ^A*tsit*^(a)- 'touch'

tsere-ññ- 'betrügen', 'deceive' (tr) (m/-/-)
        Prs XII (m) -, *tserentar-ñ*, *tserentär;*-, *tserentär*, *tsereṃñentär* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub XII — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf *tserentsi*
        Pt V in
        PPt *tsetserñu*
        Ipv —
A 3.pl.mid. Prs *tsereṃñentär* is only listed in TEB I, 217, § 390 without ref. The
Inf *tserentsi* is attested in PK AS 17A a 3 (Pinault, 1984b, 169). ETYM. A
denominative probably based on *tserek(w)** 'deception' (only pl. *tserekwa* is
attested); see Winter, 1977, 134 = 1984, 179 = 2005, 171 and Hilmarsson, 1991a,
87f. contra VW II/2, 182.

tsop[?]- 'stechen', 'sting, poke' (tr) (x/-/-)
        Prs I (x) -,-, *tsopaṃ-ne;*— |-,-, *tsoptär;*— Imp —;-,-, *tsopyeṃ-ne*|
              —;-,-, *tsopiyentär*
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I *tsopalle* Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
                Inf —
        Pt —
        PPt —
        Ipv —
The 3.sg.mid. Prs *tsoptär* is attested in PK AS 17A a 2 (Pinault, 1984b, 168), the
3.pl.mid. Imp or Opt *tsopiyentär* in PK NS 161 b 5 (having as subject *yākṣi*
'demon'), according to Broomhead II, 281.
= ^A***tsop[?]-*** 'stechen', 'sting, poke' (tr) (a/-/-)
        Prs I (a) —;-,-, *tsopiñc* Imp —
                nt-Part —
                m-Part —
                Ger I — Abstr I —
                Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
                Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —

PPt —
Ipv —

ETYM. The root is traditionally derived from the same root as *tsāpᵃ-* 'mash, crush', i.e., PIE *√dʰebʰ 'vermindern' (²LIV, 132f., without Toch.), cf. VW I, 525; 535; Adams, DoT, 743, the latter explaining the different root vocalism with different root ablaut. Differently, Schmidt, 1980, 408; 1989a, 308 derives *tsop-* from a *u*-present "urtoch. **tsap-u-*" showing *u*-umlaut and *tsāpā-* from the nasal present showing *ā*-umlaut, the nasal present in **-nā-* having replaced a former *nu*-present. To be sure, the assumption of *u*-umlaut (on which see chap. Sound Laws 1.6.) is the most likely explanation for the *o* showing up in the root of both TA and TB. Instead of a morphologically doubtful *u*-present, one better assumes that a former prop vowel **-ä-* was turned to **u* by the preceding labial, and then gets a clearly non-reduplicated present of the **molh₂-e/-ti type as reconstructed by Jasanoff.

tsk-ᵃññ- 'kennzeichnen', 'mark, characterize' (?) (—)
        Prs — Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —
        Sub — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II — Priv —
             Inf —
        Pt V in
        PPt *tsetskäññoṣ*
        Ipv —

ETYM. For the stem structure, I follow Winter, 1984a, 118 = 2005, 263 contra WTG, 309 and TEB II, 263. According to Winter, l.c., we are dealing with a denominative based on an unattested noun **tsäk* 'mark' (derived from PIE **√dei̯k̂ 'show'). Differently, VW I, 534, and Adams, DoT, 744 reckon with a deverbative from *tsäk-* 'burn'; but see the objections by Hilmarsson, 1991a, 82. To be sure, Hilmarsson, 1991a, 82 himself assumes a deverbative from the root ᴬ*tsäk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'pull (out)', so far only attested in TA with certainty.

ᴬtspäṅk- 'flay' → *tsäṅk-* 'id.'

ᴬtspok?- 'sich schmecken lassen', 'enjoy (food)' (tr) (a/-/-)
        Prs I (a) —;-,-, *tspokiñc* Imp —
             nt-Part —
             m-Part —
             Ger I — Abstr I —
             Inf —
        Sub — Opt —
             Ger II — Abstr II —
        Pt —
        PPt —

Ipv —

The second attestation of TA *tspokiñc* (TG, 484: "Frgm.") is to be found on the hardly legible fragment THT 1331 frg. b b 1: *//// [ś]we[ñc]-äṃ tspok(i)ñc-[äṃ]*. Eᴛʏᴍ. Adams, 1987, 5f. and DoT, 740 interprets TA *tspok* 'taste' as a cognate of *tsuk⁽ᵃ⁾-* 'suckle, etc.'/ *ᴬtsukᵃ-* 'drink'; see above s.v. *ᴬtsukᵃ-* 'drink'.

REFERENCES

I. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

BHSD = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit grammar and dictionary, by Franklin Edgerton, New Haven: Yale Univ. Press 1953 (several reprints).

Broomhead I-II = A Textual Edition of the British Hoernle, Stein and Weber Kuchean Manuscripts. With Transliteration, Translation, Grammatical Commentary and Vocabulary, by J.W. Broomhead, Ph.D. thesis Trinity College, Cambridge 1962 [I = Edition, II = Glossary].

CPD = A Critical Pāli Dictionary, begun by Vilhelm Trenckner, continuing the work of Dines Andersen et al., København: Ejnar Munksgaard 1924- (Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab).

DTA = Digitales Turfanarchiv. Depositum der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin — Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung. At:
http://www.bbaw.de/forschung/turfanforschung/dta/index.html

DThTA = A Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A. Volume 1: letters a-j, by Gerd Carling in collaboration with Georges-Jean Pinault and Werner Winter, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2009.

DoT = Douglas Q. Adams, A Dictionary of Tocharian B, Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi 1999 (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 10).

²DoT = Douglas Q. Adams, A Dictionary of Tocharian B, Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi. Second and revised edition (to appear).

EWAia = Manfred Mayrhofer, Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen, Band I-II, Heidelberg: Winter 1986-96.

Gr.Gramm. = Schwyzer, Eduard/Debrunner, Albert, Griechische Grammatik, München: C.H. Beck 1939-1994.

IEW = Julius Pokorny, Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, I. Band, Bern/München: Francke 1959.

IOL = The International Dunhuang Project. At: http://idp.bl.uk

²LIV = Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen, unter Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer, zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden: Reichert 2001.

M-W = A Sanskrit-English dictionary. Etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages, by Monier Monier-Williams, new edition, greatly enlarged and improved, London: Clarendon Press 1899 (several reprints).

SHT = Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden, begonnen von Ernst Waldschmidt, Wiesbaden: Steiner 1965-.

Sieg, Übers. I = Emil Sieg, Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen I, Berlin: Akad. d. Wissenschaften 1944 (Abhandl. d. Preußischen Akad. d. Wissenschaften, Jg. 1943, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 16).

Sieg, Übers. II = Emil Sieg†, Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen II, aus dem Nachlass hg. v. Werner Thomas, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1952 (Abhandl. d. Deutschen Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Kl. f. Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, 1951, 1).

Siegling, pers. copy: Personal and annotated copy of TochSprR(A) by Wilhelm Siegling. Scanned by Douglas Q. Adams with the technical assistance of Michael Tarabulski and Kevin Dobbins. To appear in facsimile at: http://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de

SWTF = Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1973-.

TEB = Tocharisches Elementarbuch, Band I. Grammatik, von Wolfgang Krause und Werner Thomas, Heidelberg: Winter 1960. Band II. Texte und Glossar, von Werner Thomas unter Mitwirkung von Wolfgang Krause, Heidelberg: Winter 1964.

TG = Tocharische Grammatik, bearbeitet in Gemeinschaft mit Wilhelm Schulze von Emil Sieg und Wilhelm Siegling, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1931.

THT = Thesaurus Indogermanischer Text- und Sprachmaterialien. TITUS. Tocharian Manuscripts from the Berlin Turfan Collection. Transcriptions prepared by Christiane Schaefer, transliterations by Tatsushi Tamai and transliterations by Katharina Kupfer. Edited by Jost Gippert, Katharina Kupfer, and Tatsushi Tamai, Frankfurt am Main, 2000-2007. At: http://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/tocharic/tht.htm

TLT = Pavel Poucha, Thesaurus Linguae Tocharicae Dialecti A, Praha: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství 1955.

TochSprR(A) = Tocharische Sprachreste, hg. v. E. Sieg und W. Siegling, I. Band. Die Texte. A. Transcription, Berlin/Leipzig: de Gruyter 1921.

TochSprR(B) = Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B, hg. v. E. Sieg und †W. Siegling, Heft 1. Die Udānālaṅkāra-Fragmente. Text, Übersetzung und Glossar, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1949. Without text siglum, no. 71-633 = TochSprR(B), no. 71-633: Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B, hg. v. †E. Sieg und †W. Siegling, Heft 2. Fragmente Nr. 71-633, aus dem Nachlaß hg. v. Werner Thomas, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1953.

²TochSprR(B) = Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B. Teil I: Die Texte. Band 1. Fragmente Nr. 1-116 der Berliner Sammlung, hg. v. †Emil Sieg und †Wilhelm Siegling, neubearbeitet und mit einem Kommentar nebst Register versehen v. Werner Thomas, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1983.

UW = Uigurisches Wörterbuch. Sprachmaterial der vorislamischen türkischen Texte aus Zentralasien, von Klaus Röhrborn, Wiesbaden: Steiner 1977-.

VW I = Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Vol. I. La phonétique et le vocabulaire, par Albert Joris Van Windekens,

Louvain: Centre International de Dialectologie Générale 1976 (Travaux publiés par le Centre International de Dialectologie Générale de l'Université Catholique Néerlandaise de Louvain XI).

VW II/1 = Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Vol. II, 1. La morphologie nominale, par Albert Joris Van Windekens, Louvain: Centre International de Dialectologie Générale 1979 (Travaux publiés par le Centre International de Dialectologie Générale de l'Université Catholique Néerlandaise de Louvain XI).

VW II/2 = Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Vol. II, 2. La morphologie verbale, par Albert Joris Van Windekens, Louvain: Centre International de Dialectologie Générale 1982 (Travaux publiés par le Centre International de Dialectologie Générale de l'Université Catholique Néerlandaise de Louvain XI).

WTG = Wolfgang Krause, Westtocharische Grammatik, Band I. Das Verbum, Heidelberg: Winter 1952.

II. WORKS CITED

Adaktylos, Anna-Maria, et al., 2007: "A Concordance to the Unedited Tocharian Texts of the Berlin Turfan Collection", *Instrumenta Tocharica*, ed. by Melanie Malzahn, Heidelberg: Winter, 39-78.

Adams, Douglas Q., 1978: "On the development of the Tocharian verbal system", JAOS 98, 277-288.

——, 1978a: "Ablaut and umlaut in the Tocharian verbal system", JAOS 98, 446-450.

——, 1979: "Tocharian AB *si-n-* 'be oppressed, afflicted' and A *si-n-* [B *soy-*] 'be satiated'", JIES 7, 297-302.

——, 1981: "The pre-history of Tocharian preterite participles", *Bono Homini Donum. Essays in Historical Linguistics in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns*, ed. by Yoël L. Arbeitman & Allan R. Bomhard, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 17-24.

——, 1982: "Studies In Tocharian Vocabulary, I: Four Verbs", JAOS 102, 133-136.

——, 1983: "Studies In Tocharian Vocabulary, II: Words Pertaining to the Lower Limbs in Tocharian B", JAOS 103, 611-613.

——, 1987: "Marginalia to the Tocharian Lexicon", TIES 1, 1-9.

——, 1988: "The formation of Tocharian B *kalāk-* 'to follow', *parāk-* 'to rejoice', *sanāp-* 'to anoint', and *walāk-* 'to dwell', with some observations on the development of Proto-Indo-European laryngeals in Tocharian", *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwartz. Studies in Anatolian, Italic, and other Indo-European languages*, ed. by Yoël L. Arbeitman, Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters, 401-410.

——, 1988a: Tocharian Historical Phonology and Morphology, New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society (AOS 71).

——, 1988b: "The expansion of the PIE *n*-stems in Tocharian: The systematic development of a paradigm", TIES 2, 7-30.

——, 1989: "Tocharian AB *kälp-* 'obtain,' B *klep-* 'stroke, investigate,' B *käly-* 'steal' and PIE **klep-* '±lay hand to'", HS 102, 241-244.

——, 1989a: "Marginalia to the Tocharian Lexicon II", TIES 3, 5-19.

——, 1990: "Some Reflexes of PIE Neuter *n*-Stems in Tocharian", TIES 4, 65-78.

——, 1990a: "Marginalia to the Tocharian Lexicon III", TIES 4, 79-86.

——, 1991: ""Head" and "Horn" in Tocharian and Albanian", *Studia Etymologica Indoeuropaea. Memoriae A.J. Van Windekens (1915-1989) dicata*, ed. Lambert Isebaert, Leuven: Peeters (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 45), 3-11.

——, 1993: "Revisiting the Person-Number Endings of Tocharian B", TIES 6, 15-28.

——, 1993a: "The Ending of the Second Person Plural in Osco-Umbrian and Tocharian", TIES 6, 29-34.

——, 1993b: "Marginalia to the Tocharian Lexicon IV: Some Paradigms and Processes of Paradigm Formation in Tocharian B", TIES 6, 35-41.

——, 1994: "The Tocharian Class III Preterite", *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, unter Mitwirkung von Benedicte Nielsen hg. v. Jens Elmegård Rasmussen, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1-28.

——, 1994a: "PIE Locative Prefixes in Tocharian", *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 4), 9-36.

——, 1994b: "A Tocharo-Germanic Correspondence: TochB *tuk-* 'be hidden' and OE *dēog* 'She [sic] concealed himself'", HS 107, 310-312.

——, 1997: "On the PIE Antecedents of Verbal Accent in Tocharian B", *Festschrift for Eric P. Hamp, vol. I*, ed. by D.Q. Adams, Washington D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man (JIES Monogr. 23), 1-10.

——, 1998: Review of Ringe, 1996 in: Lg 74, 615-617.

——, 2003: ""Give To Drink" in Tocharian B and the Reflexes of the PIE Causative", TIES 10, 1-10.

Anderson, Karen Lee, 2001: Technologies of Pain. The Body in Hell in the Sanskrit *Purāṇas*, Ph.D. thesis Univ. of Chicago.

Arndt, Walter W., 1967: *Studies in Historical Linguistics in Honor of George Sherman Lane*, ed. by Walter W. Arndt et al., Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina (University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures 58).

Balles, Irene, 2000: "Die altindische Cvikonstruktion: Alte Deutungen und neue Wege", *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1997 in Erlangen*, hg. v. Bernhard Forssman u. Robert Plath, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 25-36.

——, 2004: Die altindische Cvi-Konstruktion. Form, Funktion, Ursprung, Univ. Jena.

Bammesberger, Alfred, 1992: „Griechisch *THÉS, HÉS* und *DÓS*", *Historical Philology. Greek, Latin and Romance. Papers in Honor of Oswald Szemerényi II*, ed. by Bela Brogyanyi, Reiner Lipp, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins, 41-45.

Barton, Charles R., 1989: "PIE. **mer-*, Arm. *meranim* 'die'", IF 94, 135-157.

——, 1991: "On the denominale *a*-statives of Armenian", REArm 22, 1990-1991, 29-52.

Batke, Christiane, 1999: "Das Präsens und Imperfekt der Verben für 'Sein' im Tocharischen", TIES 8, 1-74.

Beckwith, Miles Christopher, 1996: The Greek Reduplicated Aorist, Ph.D. thesis Yale University.

——, 2007: "The Old Italic *o*-Perfect and the Tortora Inscription", *Proceedings of the 18th annual UCLA Indo-European conference, Los Angeles November 3–4, 2006*, ed. by Karlene Jones-Bley et al., Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man (JIES Monogr. 53), 77-88.

Bendahman, Jadwiga, 1993: Der reduplizierte Aorist in den indogermanischen Sprachen, Univ. Freiburg.

Benedetti, Marina, 2002: "Radici, morfemi nominali e verbali: alla ricerca dell'inaccusatività indoeuropea", AGI 87/1, 20-45.

Benveniste, Émile, 1936: "Tokharien et Indo-Européen", *Germanen und Indogermanen. Volkstum, Sprache, Heimat, Kultur. Festschrift für Herman Hirt*, Bd. II, hg. v. Helmut Arntz, Heidelberg: Winter, 227-240.

Bernhard, Franz, 1958: Die Nominalkomposition im Tocharischen, Univ. Göttingen.

——, 1965: Udanāvarga. Band I, Einleitung, Beschreibung der Handschriften, Textausgabe, Bibliographie, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden X).

——, 1968: Udanāvarga. Band II, Indices, Konkordanzen, Synoptische Tabellen, Wiesbaden: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden X).

Blažek, Václav, 2001: "Tocharian AB *kät-* "to scatter", its derivatives and relatives", IF 106, 81-83.

Bock, Bettina, 2008: Die einfach thematischen Präsentien in der dritten Konjugation des Lateinischen, Graz: Leykam.

Brixhe, Claude, 2004: "Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes. Supplément II", Kadmos 43, 1-130.

Brock, Nadja van, 1977: "Remarques sur le vocalisme du tokharien", KZ 91, 77-92.

——, 1978: "Ton et vocalisme en tokharien", *Étrennes de Septantaine. Travaux de linguistique et de grammaire comparée offerts à Michel Lejeune par un groupe de ses* élèves, Paris: Klincksieck, 223-230.

Burlak, Svetlana/Itkin, Ilya, 2003: "A sound change that never happened: The fate of Proto-Tocharian **o* (B *o*) in Tocharian A", TIES 10, 17-35.

Cardona, George, 1960: The Indo-European Thematic Aorists, Ph.D. thesis., Yale University.

Carling, Gerd, 2000: Die Funktion der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

——, 2003: "New look at the Tocharian B medical manuscript IOL Toch 306 (Stein Ch.00316.a2) of the British Library — Oriental and India Office Collections", HS 116, 75-95.

——, 2003a: "Fragments bilingues du Yogaśataka. Révision commentée de l'édition de Jean Filliozat", TIES 10, 37-68.

——, 2003b: "Middle-passive and causative: valency-change in the Tocharian B -*e*-presents without palatalization", *Language in Time and Space. A Festschrift for Werner Winter on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday*, ed. by Brigitte L. M. Bauer, Georges-Jean Pinault, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (TLSM 144), 63-76.

——, 2004: "Tocharian B *erkatse* [A *arkäts] and Related Phenomena", *Per Aspera ad Asteriscos. Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii idibus Martiis anno MMIV*, ed. by Adam Hyllested et al., Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 112), 95-101.

——, 2009: "Reconsidering the system: verbal categorization and the coding of valency in Tocharian", *Internal Reconstruction in Indo-European. Methods, results, and problems. Section Papers from the XVI International Conference on Historical Linguistics, University of Copenhagen, 11th–15th August, 2003*, ed. by Jens Elmegård Rasmussen et al., Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 49-63.

Catsanicos, Jean, 1991: Recherches sur le Vocabulaire de la Faute. Apports du Hittite à l'étude de la phraséologie indo-européenne, Paris: SEPOA (Cahiers de NABU 2).

Cavoto, Fabrizio Salvatore Dom, 2004: Les Désinences Personnelles en Indo-Européen, Ph.D. thesis Univ. of California, Los Angeles.

Cheung, Johnny, 2007: Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb, Leiden/Boston: Brill (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 2).

Chomsky, Noam, 1981: Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures, Dordrecht etc.: Foris (7th Edition, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1993).

Chung Jin-Il, 1998: Die Pravāraṇā in den kanonischen Vinaya-Texten der Mūlasarvāstivādin und der Sarvāstivādin, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfanfunden 7).

Cohen, Yoram, 2002: Taboos and Prohibitions in Hittite Society. A Study of the Hittite Expression *natta āra* ('not permitted'), Heidelberg: Winter (Texte der Hethiter 24).

Čop, Bojan, 1971: "Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung VI", KZ 85, 26-30.

——, 1975: Studien im Tocharischen Auslaut, Ljubljana: Oddelek za Primerjalno Jezikoslovje in Orientalistiko.

Couvreur, Walter, 1938: "La désinence -*au* et le morphème -*oy*-, -*i*- du koutchéen", BSL 39, 243-248.

——, 1938a: "Les dérivés verbaux en -ske/o- du hittite et du tocharien", REIE 1, 89-101.

——, 1942: "L'étymologie du tocharien", RBPh 21, 5-23.

——, 1946: "Le caractère sarvāstivādin-vaibhāṣika des fragments tokhariens a d'après les marques et épithètes du Bouddha", Le Muséon 59, 577-610.

——, 1947: "Zum Tocharischen I", REIE 4, 137-158.

——, 1947a: Hoofdzaken van de Tochaarse Klank- en Vormleer, Leuven: Beheer van Philologische Studiën (Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven, Philologische Studiën, Teksten en Verhandelingen II, 4).

——, 1948: "Het eenhoornmotief in de Tochaarse B-literatuur", *Miscellanea J. Gessler*, 'S-Gravenhage: Nijhoff, 325-330.

——, 1949: "Zur tocharischen Etymologie I", IF 60, 33-37.

——, 1949a: Review of Lane, 1948 in: BiOr 6/1, 32.

——, 1952: "Overzicht van de Tochaarse letterkunde", Jahrbericht van het vooraziatisch-egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux III/9-10, 1944-1948[1952], 561-571.

——, 1953: "Het leven van de Boeddha volgens de Tochaarse bronnen", *Handelingen van het Twintigste Vlaams Filologencongres*, Antwerpen, 275-291.

——, 1954: Review of WTG in: GGA 208, 79-92.

——, 1954a: "Kutschische Vinaya- und Prātimokṣa-Fragmente aus der Sammlung Hoernle", *Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller. Zum 65. Geburtstag*, gewidmet von seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern, Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 43-52.

——, 1954b: Review of Sieg, Übers. II in: OLZ 5/6, 259-261.

——, 1954c: "Koetsjische literaire fragmenten uit de Berlijnse verzameling (naar aanleiding van Sieg & Siegling's *Tocharische Sprachreste*)", Handelingen VIII der Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal- en Letterkunde en Geschiedenis, 97-117.

——, 1955: "Nieuwe Koetsjische fragmenten van de Bibliothèque Nationale te Parijs", *Handelingen van het Eenentwintigste Vlaams Filologencongres*, Leuven, 110-116.

——, 1955a: Review of TochSprR(B), 1953 in: BiOr 12/1, 40-41.

——, 1956: "Bemerkungen zu Pavel Pouchas *Thesaurus linguae tocharicae dialecti A*", La Nouvelle Clio 7-8, 1955-56, 67-98.

——, 1957: Review of Krause, 1955 in: BiOr 14/1, 46-47.

——, 1957a: Review of Härtel, 1957 in: IIJ 1, 315-317.

——, 1959: Review of TLT in: BiOr 16/5-6, 251-253.

——, 1961: Review of Annemarie von Gabain, Türkische Turfantexte X. Das Avadāna des Dämons Āṭavaka, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1959 in: BiOr 18/1-2, 102-104.

——, 1961a: Review of von Gabain/Winter, 1958 in: BiOr 18/1-2, 100-102.

——, 1964: "Nieuwe Koetsjische fragmenten van het Araṇemijātaka", Orientalia Gandensia 1, 237-249 (+ Taf. I-VII).

——, 1966: "Sanskrit-Tochaarse Mātṛceṭafragmenten", Orientalia Gandensia 3, 159-185 (+ Taf. I-XII).

——, 1967: "Sanskrit-Tochaarse en Sanskrit-Koetsjische trefwoordenlijsten van de Dīrghagāma (Dīghanikāya)", Orientalia Gandensia 4, 151-165.

——, 1968: "Zu einigen Sanskrit-Kutschischen Listen von Stichwörtern aus dem Catuṣpariṣasūtra, Daśottarasūtra und Nidānasaṃyukta", *Pratidānam. Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies. Presented to F.B.J. Kuiper on His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. by J.C. Heesterman et al., The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 275-282.

——, 1970: "Boeddhistische Sanskritfragmenten in Koetsjische handschriften-verzamelingen", ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΙΣ. *Gedenkboek Prof. Dr. E. A. Leemans*, Brugge: De Tempel (Werken uitgegeven door de Faculteit van de letteren en wijsbegeerte, Rijksuniversiteit te Gent 149), 175-184 + 2 plates.

Cowell, Edward B./Neil, R. A., 1886: The Divyāvadāna. A collection of early Buddhist legends. Now first edited from the Nepalese Sanskrit mss. in Cambridge and Paris, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Cowgill, Warren Crawford, 1957: The Indo-European Long-Vowel Preterits, Ph.D. thesis Yale University.

——, 1963: Review of Jaan Puhvel, Laryngeals and the Indo-European Verb in: Lg 39, 248-270 = Cowgill, 2006, 473-495.

——, 1967: "Ablaut, Accent, and Umlaut in the Tocharian Subjunctive", *Studies in Historical Linguistics in Honor of George Sherman Lane*, ed. by Walter W. Arndt et al., Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina (University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures 58), 171-181 = Cowgill, 2006, 445-450.

——, 1974: "More Evidence for Indo-Hittite: The Tense-Aspect Systems", *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Linguistics, Bologna-Florence, Aug. 28 – Sept. 2, 1974*, vol. II, ed. by Luigi Heilmann, Bologna: Mulino, 557-570 = Cowgill, 2006, 37-51.

——, 1985: "The Personal Endings of Thematic Verbs in Indo-European", *Grammatische Kategorien, Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, 20.–25. Februar 1983*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath unter Mitarbeit von Veronica Rittner, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 99-118 = Cowgill, 2006, 69-76.

——, 1985a: Review of *Bono Homini Donum. Essays in Historical Linguistics in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns*, ed. by Yoël L. Arbeitman & Allan R. Bomhard, Amsterdam: Benjamins in: Kratylos 29, 1984[1985], 1-13 = Cowgill, 2006, 509-518.

——, 1985b: "Loss of morphophonemic alternation in moribund categories, as exemplified in the Gothic verb", *Studia Linguistica, Diachronica et Synchronica. Werner Winter sexagenario anno MCMLXXIII gratis animis ab eius collegis, amicis discipulisque oblata*, hg. v. Ursula Pieper u. Gerhard Stickel, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 145-149 = Cowgill, 2006, 441-444.

——, 2006: The Collected Writings of Warren Cowgill, ed. with an Introduction by Jared S. Klein, with contributions by other former colleagues and students, Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave Press.

Delbrück, Berthold, 1888: Altindische Syntax, Halle a. d. Salle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

——, 1897: Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen, zweiter Theil (Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen, v. Karl Brugmann u. Berthold Delbrück, vierter Band), Strassburg: Trübner.

Dettori, Emanuele, 1999: "ναυᾱγ-/ναυηγ-, una iscrizione e alcune forme di ἄγνυμι", Κατὰ Διάλεκτον. *Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale di Dialettologia Greca, Napoli – Fiaiano d'Ischia, 25–28 settembre 1996*, a cura di A.C. Cassio = A.I.O.N., Dipartimento di Studi del Mondo Classico e del Mediterraneo Antico, Sct. Filologico-Letteraria 19, 1997, 279-317.

Di Giovine, Paolo, 1995: "Sul preterito a vocalismo radicale lungo nelle lingue indoeuropee 'occidentali'", *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume. Part One,* ed. by Wojciech Smoczynski, Cracow: Universitas (Analecta Indoevropaea Cracoviensia II), 115-129.

Dietz, Rudolf, 1981: Der Gebrauch der Partizipia Präsentis im Tocharischen. Eine syntaktische Untersuchung, Univ. Frankfurt am Main.

——, 1988: "Nachträge zur Syntax der tocharischen Partizipien", *Studia Indogermanica et Slavica. Festgabe für Werner Thomas zum 65. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Peter Kosta et al., München: Sagner, 123-135.

Driessen, C. Michiel, 2001: "On the Etymology of Lat. *urbs*", JIES 29, 41-68.

Dubois, Laurent, 2006: "Le nom de Pythagore", *La langue poétique indo-européenne. Actes du Colloque de travail de la Société des Études Indo-Européennes, Paris, 22–24 octobre 2003*, éd. par Georges-Jean Pinault et Daniel Petit, Leuven/Paris: Peeters, 55-62.

Eben, Eric F., 2004: The Phonology of Formulas: The Case of "Resonant Lengthening" in Homer, Ph.D. thesis Cornell University.

Eichner, Heiner, 1975: "Die Vorgeschichte des hethitischen Verbalsystems", *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft Regensburg. 9.–14. September 1973*, hg. v. Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 71-103.

——, 1985: "Das Problem des Ansatzes eines urindogermanischen Numerus ‚Kollektiv' (‚Komprehensiv')", *Grammatische Kategorien. Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Berlin, 20.–25. Februar 1983*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath unter Mitarbeit von Veronica Rittner, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 134-169.

Eichner, Heiner/Reinhart, Johannes, 2006: Review of *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského 11* in: Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch 51, 2005[2006], 278-281.

Eyþórsson, Þórhallur, 1993: "Proto-Indo-European origins of Tocharian accent: Class V subjunctives in Tocharian B", TIES 6, 43-94.

——, 1997: "Accent in Tocharian B Causatives", TIES 7, 239-254.

Fellner, Hannes A., 2005: Die Vertretung der Labiovelare im Tocharischen, Dipl.-Arbeit, Univ. Wien.

——, 2006: "On the Development of Labiovelars in Tocharian", *Proceedings of the seventeenth annual UCLA Indo-European conference, Los Angeles*

October 27–28, 2005, ed. by Karlene Jones-Bley et al., Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man (JIES Monogr. 52), 51-65.

Filliozat, Jean, 1948: Fragments de textes koutchéens de médecine et de magie. Texte, parallèles sanskrits et tibétains, traduction et glossaire, Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Finot, Louis/Huber, Édouard, 1913: "Le Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādins, avec la version chinoise de Kumārajīva", JA nov.-déc., 465-558.

Flobert, Pierre, 1975: Les Verbes Déponents Latins des Origines à Charlemagne, Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres".

Forssman, Bernhard, 1964: "δρακείς", MSS 16, 17-19.

——, 1978: "Homerisch δειδέχαται und Verwandtes", Sprache 24, 3-24.

——, 1994: "Zu hethitisch *šipand-* und *išpand-*", *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, unter Mitwirkung von Benedicte Nielsen hg. v. Jens Elemgård Rasmussen, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 93-106.

Gabain, Annemarie von/Winter, Werner, 1958: Türkische Turfantexte IX. Ein Hymnus an den Vater Mani auf "Tocharisch" B mit alttürkischer Übersetzung, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Abhandl. d. Deutschen Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Kl. f. Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, 1956, 2).

García Ramón, José Luis, 1986: "Griego ἰάομαι", *o-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Annemarie Etter, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 497-514.

——, 2004: "Zum Paradigma von idg. **nes-*: homerisch ἀπενάσσατο, kausat. ἀπονάσσωσιν als Aoriste von (°)νέομαι und die Entstehung des Präs. ναίω", *Analecta homini universali dicata. Arbeiten zur Indogermanistik, Linguistik, Philologie, Politik, Musik und Dichtung. Festschrift für Oswald Panagl zum 65. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Thomas Krisch et al., Stuttgart: Hans-Dieter Heinz, Akademischer Verlag, 33-47.

Geng Shimin/Klimkeit, Hans-Joachim, 1985: "Das 16. Kapitel der Hami-Version der Maitrisimit", Journal of Turkish Studies 9, 71-132.

——, 1988: Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya. Die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hami-Version der Maitrisimit. Teil I: Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar, in Zusammenarbeit mit Helmut Eimer und Jens Peter Laut hg., übers. und kommentiert von Geng Shimin und Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (Asiatische Forschungen 103)

Geng Shimin/Klimkeit, Hans-Joachim/Laut, Jens Peter, 1987: "„Der Herabstieg des Bodhisattva Maitreya vom Tuṣita-Götterland zur Erde". Das 10. Kapitel der Hami-Handschrift der *Maitrisimit*", AoF 14, 350-376.

——, 1988: "„Das Erscheinen des Bodhisattva". Das 11. Kapitel der Hami-Handschrift der *Maitrisimit*", AoF 15, 315-366.

——, 1991: "„Die Weltflucht des Bodhisattva". Das 13. Kapitel der Hami-Handschrift der *Maitrisimit*", AoF 18, 264-296.

——, 1998: Eine buddhistische Apokalypse. Die Höllenkapitel (20-25) und die Schlußkapitel (26-27) der Hami-Handschrift der alttürkischen *Maitrisimit*. Unter Einbeziehung von Manuskriptteilen des Textes aus Säŋim und Murtuk. Einleitung, Transkription und Übersetzung von Geng Shimin,

Hans-Joachim Klimkeit und Jens Peter Laut, Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag (Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akad. d. Wissenschaften 103).

Geng Shimin/Laut, Jens Peter/Pinault, Georges-Jean, 2004: "Neue Ergebnisse der *Maitrisimit*-Forschung", ZDMG 154, 347-369.

——, 2004a: "Neue Ergebnisse der *Maitrisimit*-Forschung (II): Struktur und Inhalt des 26. Kapitels", Studies on the Inner Asian Languages 19, 29-94 (+ Tafeln).

Georg, Stefan, 2001: Review of DoT in: JIES 29, 490-495.

George, Coulter H., 2005: Expressions of Agency in Ancient Greek, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Gippert, Jost, 1987: "Zu den sekundären Kasusaffixen des Tocharischen", TIES 1, 22-39.

Gotō, Toshifumi, 1987: Die I. Präsensklasse im Vedischen. Untersuchungen der vollstufigen thematischen Wurzelpräsentia, Wien: Verlag d. ÖAW (SbÖAW 489).

Hackstein, Olav, 1993: "Eine weitere griechisch-tocharische Gleichung: Griechisch πτῆξαι und tocharisch B *pyāktsi*", Glotta 70, 1992[1993], 136-165.

——, 1993a: "Osttocharische Reflexe grundsprachlicher Präsensbildungen von idg. *$\hat{g}neh_3$- '(er)kennen'", *Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Gerhard Meiser, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 72), 148-158.

——, 1993b: "On the Prehistory of Dual Inflection in the Tocharian Verb", Sprache 35, 1991-1993[1993], 47-70.

——, 1995: Untersuchungen zu den sigmatischen Präsensstammbildungen des Tocharischen, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (HS Erg.-Heft 38).

——, 1997: "Präverb, Post- und Präposition im Tocharischen: Ein Beitrag zur Rekonstruktion urindogermanischer Syntax", TIES 7, 35-60.

——, 1998: "Tocharisch und Westindogermanisch: Strukturell uneinheitliche Laryngalreflexe im Tocharischen (Uridg. *-Uh_1C- vs. *-$Uh_{2,3}(C$-*) und *#$h_1\mathring{R}C$- vs. *#$h_{2,3}\mathring{R}C$-*)", *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen. Akten der X. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Innsbruck, 22.–28. September 1996*, hg. v. Wolfgang Meid, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 93), 217-236.

——, 2000: Review of Hilmarsson, 1996 in: Kratylos 45, 96-104.

——, 2001: "Studien zur Grammatikalisierung in älteren indogermanischen Sprachen", HS 114, 15-42.

——, 2002: "Uridg. *CH.CC > *C.CC", HS 115, 1-22.

——, 2002a: Die Sprachform der homerischen Epen, Wiesbaden: Reichert (Serta Graeca 15).

——, 2003: Review of Adams, DoT in: IIJ 46, 177-189.

——, 2003a: "Zur Entwicklung von Modalität in Verbaladjektiven", *Indogermanisches Nomen. Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Freiburg, 19. bis 22. September 2001*, hg. v. Eva Tichy et al., Bremen: Hempen, 51-66.

——, 2003b: "Reflexivpronomina, Präverbien und Lokalpartikel in indogermanischen Sprachen", TIES 10, 69-95.

——, 2004: "Zur Entwicklung alter Präsentien und Perfekta zu Konjunktiv- und Futurformen in einigen altindogermanischen Sprachen", *Die Indogermanistik und ihre Anrainer. Dritte Tagung der Vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaftler der Neuen Länder*, hg. v. Thorwald Poschenrieder, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 113), 81-113.

——, 2004a: "From Discourse to Syntax: The Case of Compound Interrogatives in Indo-European and Beyond", *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles November 7–8, 2003*, ed. by Karlene Jones-Bley et al., Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man (JIES Monogr. 49), 257-298.

——, 2005: "Archaismus oder historischer Sprachkontakt. Zur Frage westindogermanisch-tocharischer Konvergenzen", *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*, hg. v. Gerhard Meiser und Olav Hackstein, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 169-184.

——, 2007: "Ablative Formations", *Verba Docenti. Studies in historical and Indo-European linguistics presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by students, colleagues, and friends*, ed. by Alan J. Nussbaum, Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave Press, 131-153.

Härtel, Herbert, 1956: Karmavācanā. Formulare für den Gebrauch im buddhistischen Gemeindeleben aus ostturkestanischen Sanskrit-Handschriften, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden III).

Hahn, Michael, 1992: Haribhaṭṭa and Gopadatta. Two Authors in the Succession of Āryaśūra. On the Rediscovery of Parts of their Jātakamālās. Second edition. Thoroughly revised and enlarged, Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Hajnal, Ivo, 1996: "Zur Vorgeschichte der litauischen Verben auf °inti (und ihrer Entsprechung in den anderen baltischen Sprachen)", HS 109, 280-209.

——, 2002: "Mykenisch *e-we-pe-se-so-me-na* und die Frage eines frühgriechischen Umlauts", *Novalis Indogermanica. Festschrift für G. Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. by Matthias Fritz and Susanne Zeilfelder, Graz: Leykam, 201-213.

Harðarson, Jón Axel, 1993: Studien zum urindogermanischen Wurzelaorist und dessen Vertretung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 74).

——, 1997: "Bemerkungen zum reduplizierten Präteritum II im Tocharischen und zum Kausativaorist im Altindischen", *Sound law and analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S.P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, ed. by Alexander Lubotsky, Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 9), 95-102.

——, 1998: "Mit dem Suffix *-eh₁- bzw. *-(e)h₁-i̯e/o- gebildete Verbalstämme im Indogermanischen", *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen. Akten der X. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Innsbruck, 22.–28.*

September 1996, hg. v. Wolfgang Meid, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 93), 323-339.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe, 1987: Das Varṇārhavarṇa des Mātṛceṭa, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden XII).

——, 1988: Neue Aśvaghoṣa- und Mātṛceṭa-Fragmente, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (NAWG 1988, 2).

Hartmann, Markus, 2001: "Wiederum zu den tocharischen Verben auf *-tk-*", MSS 61, 95-117.

Haspelmath, Martin, 1993: "More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternations", *Causatives and transitivity*, ed. by Bernard Comrie and Maria Polinsky, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 87-120.

Hermann, Eduard, 1923: Silbenbildung im Griechischen und in den andern indogermanischen Sprachen, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (KZ Erg.-Heft 2).

Hill, Eugen, 2007: Die Aorist-Präsentien des Indoiranischen. Untersuchungen zur Morphologie und Semantik einer Präsensklasse, Bremen: Hempen (Münchner Forschungen zur historischen Sprachwissenschaft 7).

Hilmarsson, Jörundur, 1984: "Reconstruction of a Tocharian paradigm: the numeral "one"", KZ 97, 135-147.

——, 1985: "Tocharian B *krorīyai* (obl. sg.), A *kror* "crescent, horn of the moon" ~ Hitt. *karauar* "horn" ~ Arm. *eǉwr* "horn" < I.-E. **ghrēuṛ*", Sprache 31, 40-47.

——, 1985a: "The Vocalism of Tocharian AB *yok* "hair; colour"", IF 90, 83-87.

——, 1985b: "Toch. A *se*, B *soy* "son" = Gk. υἱύς "son", — another Mirage?", IF 89, 1984[1985], 29-38.

——, 1986: Studies in Tocharian Phonology, Morphology and Etymology with special emphasis on the *o*-Vocalism, Univ. Reykjavík.

——, 1987: "The element *-ai*(-) in the Tocharian nominal flexion", Sprache 33, 34-55.

——, 1987a: "Stray notes on the interrogative pronominal stems in Tocharian", TIES 1, 40-48.

——, 1987b: "Analysis of the Tocharian verb B *en-* (*enäsk-*), A *en-* (*enäs-*) "to instruct"", TIES 1, 49-58.

——, 1987c: "On the History and Distribution of Suffixal *-y-/-iy-* in Tocharian", Sprache 33, 79-93.

——, 1987d: "Reflexes of I.-E. **suH₂n̥to-/-ōn* "sunny" in Germanic and Tocharian", Sprache 33, 56-78.

——, 1988: "Tocharian B *yapoy*, A *ype* "land"", TIES 2, 31-51.

——, 1988a: "Tocharian B *okt*, A *okät* "8" and the development of final Indo-European *-ō in Tocharian", *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwartz. Studies in Anatolian, Italic, and other Indo-European Languages*, ed. by Yoël L. Arbeitman, Louvain-la-neuve: Peeters, 505-519.

——, 1989: The Dual Forms of Nouns and Pronouns in Tocharian, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 1).

——, 1989a: "Rounding and Exceptions from Rounding in East Tocharian", IF 94, 101-134.

——, 1990: "The Verb *säl-* in Tocharian", TIES 4, 87-118.

——, 1991: The Nasal Prefixes in Tocharian. A Study in Word Formation, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 3).

——, 1991a: "The elements *-ñ-* and *-ññ-* in Tocharian present and subjunctive classes", TIES 5, 61-122.

——, 1991b: "Tocharian etymological notes 1-13", TIES 5, 137-183.

——, 1991c: "The verb B *sain-*, A *se-n-*, in Tocharian", *Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. Ji Xianlin on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday, vol. I*, ed. Li Zheng et al., Nanchang: Jiangxi ren min chu ban she, 67-90.

——, 1991d: "East Tocharian *ksär* "in the morning" from Indo-European *$\hat{g}hdh\underset{\smile}{i}estro$-", *Studia Etymologica Indoeuropaea. Memoriae A.J. Van Windekens (1915-1989) dicata*, ed. Lambert Isebaert, Leuven: Peeters (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 45), 121-129.

——, 1994: "The Nasal Prefix and the Private in Tocharian", *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 4), 37-60.

——, 1994a: "Tocharian B *wāyā-*, A *wā-* 'to lead' and East Tocharian Optatives in *-w-*", *Iranian and Indo-European Studies. Memorial Volume Otakar Klíma*, ed. by Petr Vavroušek, Praha: enigma, 99-108.

——, 1996: Materials for a Tocharian Historical and Etymological Dictionary, ed. by Alexander Lubotsky, Guðrún Þórhallsdóttir, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 5).

Hitch, Doug, 1993: "The Kuchean Hymn in Manichean Script", TIES 6, 95-132.

Hock, Hans Henrich, 1991: "Dialects, diglossia, and diachronic phonology in early Indo-Aryan", *Studies in the Historical Phonology of Asian Languages*, ed. by William G. Boltz and Michael C. Shapiro, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science 77), 119-159.

Hoernle, A.F. Rudolf, 1916: Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan. Facsimiles with Transcripts, Translations and Notes, ed. in conjunction with other scholars by A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, Oxford: Clarendon 1916 (reprint St. Leonards: Ad Orientem/Amsterdam: Philo Press 1970).

Hoffmann, Karl, 1967: Der Injunktiv im Veda, Heidelberg: Winter.

——, 1968: "Hethitisch *luk(k)-*, *lukki-*", KZ 82, 214-220 = Hoffmann, 1975, 251-257.

——, 1970: "Das Kategoriensystem des indogermanischen Verbums", MSS 28, 19-41 = Hoffmann, 1976, 523-540.

——, 1975: *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, hg. v. Johanna Narten, Band 1, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

——, 1976: "Die Aoristbildungen von ved. *vṛt*", *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*, hg. v. Johanna Narten, Band 2, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 589-592.

Hollifield, Patrick Henry, 1977: On the system of conjugation in Proto-Indo-European, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University.

——, 1978: "Indo-European Etymologies", JIES 6, 173-182.

Huang Wenbi, 1958: Talimu Pendi kaogu ji [Archäologischer Bericht über das Tarimbecken], Beijing: Kexue Chubanshe.

Isebaert, Lambert, 1980: De Indo-Iraanse bestanddelen in de Tocharische woordenschat. Vraagstukken van fonische productinterferentie, met bijzondere aandacht voor de Indo-Iraanse diafonen *a*, *ā*, Univ. Leuven.

——, 1992: "Lés préfixes à nasale dans les dialectes tokhariens", Orbis 35, 1988-90[1992], 283-292.

——, 1995: "Etyma Tocharica", *Guerre et Paix. War and Peace*, ed. by C. Cannuyer et al., Bruxelles etc.: Société Belge d'Études Orientales (Acta Orientalia Belgica 9, 1994[1995]), 291-299.

——, 2002: "Le tokharien", *Langues indo-européennes,* sous la direction de Françoise Bader, 2ème édition, Paris: CNRS, 85-100.

Itkin, I[lya] B., 2002: "The linguistic features of Tocharian A manuscript *Maitreyāvadanavyākaraṇa*", Manuscripta Orientalia 8/3, 11-16.

——, 2004: Review of Adams, DoT in: Voprosy Jasykoznanija 2004/4, 159-165.

Ittzés, Máté, 2008: "Morphologie und Ursprung der ionischen Iterativpräterita", Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debrecenensis 44, 13-34.

Jamison, Stephanie W., 1983: Function and Form in the -*áya*-Formations of the Rig Veda and Atharva Veda, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (KZ Erg.-Heft 31).

Janda, Michael, 1997: "Der Pflug des Meeres", Sprache 37, 1995[1997], 5-11.

——, 2000: Eleusis: das indogermanische Erbe der Mysterien, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 96).

Jasanoff, Jay H., 1975: "Class III presents in Tocharian", *Indo-European Studies II*, ed. Calvert Watkins, Cambridge, Mass., 102-115.

——, 1977: "The *r*-endings of the IE Middle", Sprache 23, 159-170.

——, 1978: Stative and middle in Indo-European, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 23).

——, 1979: "The Position of the *ḫi*-Conjugation", *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch. Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens*, hg. v. Erich Neu und Wolfgang Meid, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 25), 79-90.

——, 1984: "The IE. "*ā*-Preterite" and Related Forms", IF 88, 1983[1984], 54-83.

——, 1987: "Some irregular imperatives in Tocharian", *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985). Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University, June 6–9, 1985*, ed. by Calvert Watkins, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 92-112.

——, 1988: "The sigmatic aorist in Tocharian and Indo-European", TIES 2, 52-79.

——, 1989: "Language and Gender in the Tarim Basin: the Tocharian 1 Sg. Pronoun", TIES 3, 125-147.

——, 1989a: "Old Irish *bé* 'woman'", Ériu 40, 135-141.

——, 1991: "The origin of the Italic imperfect subjunctive", KZ 104, 84-104.

——, 1992: "Reconstructing morphology: the role of *o*-grade in Hittite and Tocharian verb inflection", *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures*, ed. by Edgar C. Polomé, Werner Winter, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (TLSM 58), 129-155.

——, 1994: "The Brittonic Subjunctive and Future", *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, unter Mitwirkung von Benedicte Nielsen hg. v. Jens Elemgård Rasmussen, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 199-220.

——, 1994a: "Aspects of the internal history of the PIE verbal system", *Früh-, Mittel- und Spätindogermanisch. Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich*, hg. v. George E. Dunkel et al., Wiesbaden: Reichert, 149-168.

——, 1997: "Gathic Avestan *cikōitərə̄š*", *Sound law and analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S.P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, ed. by Alexander Lubotsky, Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 9), 119-130.

——, 1998: "The Thematic Conjugation Revisited", *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, ed. by Jay Jasanoff et al., Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 92), 301-316.

——, 2003: Hittite and the Indo-European Verb, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

——, 2004: ""Stative" *-ē- revisited", Sprache 43, 2002-2003[2004], 127-170.

——, 2007: "From Reduplication to Ablaut: The Class VII Strong Verbs of Northwest Germanic", HS 120, 241-284.

——, 2008: "*gʷes-, *(z)gʷes-, *(s)gʷesh₂-? The PIE root for 'extinguish/go out'", *Morphology and Language History. In honor of Harold Koch*, ed. by Claire Bowern et al., Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 298), 155-166.

Ji Xianlin, 1987: "Translation from the Tocharian Maitreyasamitināṭaka. The 39th leaf (2 pages: 76 YQ 1.39 1/1 and 1.39 ½) of the Xinjiang Museum version", TIES 1, 70-76.

Ji Xianlin/Winter, Werner/Pinault, Georges-Jean, 1998: Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka of the Xinjiang Museum, China. Transliterated, translated and annotated by Ji Xianlin in collaboration with Werner Winter, Georges-Jean Pinault, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (TLSM 113).

Joseph, Lionel S., 1987: "The origin of the Celtic denominatives in *-sag-", *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985). Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University, June 6–9, 1985*, ed. by Calvert Watkins, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 113-159.

Katz, Joshua T., 1995: "Homeric Formula and the Tocharian Word for 'Year': A Transferred Epithet", Glotta 72, 1994[1995], 151-168.

——, 1997: "Ein tocharisches Lautgesetz für Monosyllaba", TIES 7, 61-87.

Kemmer, Suzanne, 1993: The Middle Voice, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins (TSL 23).

Kim, Ronald I., 2000: "'To drink' in Anatolian, Tocharian, and Proto-Indo-European", HS 113, 151-170.

——, 2001: "Tocharian B *śem* ~ Latin *vēnit*? Szemerényi's Law and **ē* in PIE Root Aorist", MSS 61, 119-147.

——, 2003: "Uncovering the Prehistory of the Tocharian Class II Preterite", HS 116, 190-233.

——, 2005: Review of Jasanoff, 2003 in: Diachronica 22, 191-200.

——, 2006: Review of Svetlana Burlak, Istoričeskaja Fonetika Toxarskix Jazykov, Moskva, 2000 in: Kratylos 51, 130-136.

——, 2007: "The Tocharian Subjunctive in Light of the *h₂e*-Conjugation Model", *Verba Docenti. Studies in historical and Indo-European linguistics presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by students, colleagues, and friends*, ed. by Alan J. Nussbaum, Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave Press, 185-200.

——, 2007a: "Proto-Indo-European **-(V)yᵉ/ₒ*-Presents in Tocharian", *Proceedings of the 18th annual UCLA Indo-European conference, Los Angeles November 3–4, 2006*, ed. by Karlene Jones-Bley et al., Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man (JIES Monogr. 53), 47-63.

——, 2007b: "The Duke of York Comes to Xinjiang: Ablaut, Analogy, and Epenthesis in Tocharian Nasal Presents", HS 120, 66-104.

——, 2009: "Root and Derived Preterites in Tocharian", MSS 63, 2003[2009], 11-44.

——, 2009a: "Tocharian B *-ñ* '(to) me', *-c* '(to) you', *paṣ* 'go!'", TIES 11, 49-61.

Klaiman, M. H., 1991: Grammatical Voice, Cambridge etc.: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Klingenschmitt, Gert, 1975: "Tocharisch und Urindogermanisch", *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.–14. September 1973*, hg. v. Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 148-163 = Klingenschmitt, 2005, 133-147.

——, 1975a: "Altindisch *śaśvat-*", MSS 33, 67-78 = Klingenschmitt, 2005, 149-157.

——, 1978: "Zum Ablaut des indogermanischen Kausativs", KZ 92, 1-13 = Klingenschmitt, 2005, 159-69.

——, 1982: Das altarmenische Verbum, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

——, 1987: "Erbe und Neuerung beim germanischen Demonstrativpronomen", Althochdeutsch I, hg. v. Rolf Bergmann, 169-189, Heidelberg: Winter = Klingenschmitt, 2005, 243-268.

——, 1989: "Altlateinisch *exprētus* (Plaut. Bacch. 446)", *Indogermania Europaea. Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 60. Geburtstag am 12.11.1989*, hg. v. Karin Heller et al., Graz: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (Grazer Linguistische Monographien 4), 79-100 = Klingenschmitt, 2005, 269-283.

——, 1992: "Die lateinische Nominalflexion", *Latein und Indogermanisch. Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg, 23.–26. September 1986*, hg. v. Oswald Panagl und Thomas Krisch, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 64), 89-135 = Klingenschmitt, 2005, 301-351.

——, 1994: "Das Tocharische in indogermanistischer Sicht", *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September*

1990, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 4), 310-411 = Klingenschmitt, 2005, 353-435.

——, 1994a: "Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen", *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, unter Mitwirkung von Benedicte Nielsen hg. v. Jens Elmegård Rasmussen, Wiesbaden: Reichert 235-251 = Klingenschmitt, 2005, 449-463.

——, 1994b: "Das Albanische als Glied der indogermanischen Sprachfamilie", *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, unter Mitwirkung von Benedicte Nielsen hg. v. Jens Elmegård Rasmussen, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 221-233 = Klingenschmitt, 2005, 437-447.

——, 2004: "Zur Etymologie der klassischen Sprachen", *Artes et Scientiæ. Festschrift für Ralf-Peter Ritter zum 65. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Peter Anreiter et al., Wien: Edition Praesens, 239-252 = Klingenschmitt, 2005, 531-542.

——, 2005: *Aufsätze zur Indogermanistik*, hg. v. Michael Janda et al., Hamburg: Kovač.

——, 2005a: "Sprachverwandtschaft in Europa", *Gene, Sprachen und ihre Evolution. Wie verwandt sind die Menschen — wie verwandt sind ihre Sprachen?*, hg. v. Günter Hauska, Regensburg: Universitätsverlag, 100-132.

Kloekhorst, Alwin, 2008: Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon, Leiden/Boston: Brill (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5).

——, 2008a: "The Hittite 2pl.-ending *-šten(i)*", *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia, Roma, 5 – 9 settembre 2005*, a cura di Alfonso Archi e Rita Francia (= SMEA 50), 493-500.

Knobl, Werner, 2004: "The Nonce Formation. A more-than-momentary look at the *Augenblicksbildung*", *The Vedas. Texts, Language & Ritual. Proceedings of the Third International Vedic Workshop, Leiden 2002*, ed. by Arlo Griffiths and Jan E.M. Houben, Groningen: Forsten (Groningen Oriental Studies XX), 261-283.

Knoll, Gabriele, 1996: Die Verwendungsweisen der Adjektive im Tocharischen, Univ. Frankfurt am Main.

Kölver, Bernhard, 1965: Der Gebrauch der sekundären Kasus im Tocharischen, Univ. Frankfurt am Main.

Koller, Bernhard, 2008: An Approach to Tocharian Schwa-Zero Alternations in Government Phonology, Dipl.-Arbeit, Univ. Wien.

Kortlandt, Frederik, 1979: "The Old Irish absolute and conjunct endings and questions of relative chronology", Ériu 30, 35-53 = Kortlandt, 2007, 1-23.

——, 1984: "Old Irish subjunctives and futures and their Proto-Indo-European origins", Ériu 35, 179-187 = Kortlandt, 2007, 65-74.

——, 1994: "The Fate of the Sigmatic Aorist in Tocharian", *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 4), 61-65.

——, 1996: "The Tocharian Imperfect", HS 109, 169-174.

——, 2007: Italo-Celtic origins and prehistoric development of the Irish language, Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 14).

Krause, Wolfgang, 1950: "The Imperfect in British and Kuchean", Journal of Celtic Studies 1, 24-34.

——, 1951: "Zu einigen tocharischen Personalendungen", KZ 69, 150-164.

——, 1955: Tocharisch. Handbuch der Orientalistik, vierter Bd. Iranistik, dritter Abschnitt, Leiden: Brill.

——, 1955a: "Zur Entstehung des lateinischen *uī*- und *vī*-Perfekts", *Corolla Linguistica. Festschrift Ferdinand Sommer zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Mai 1955*, dargebracht v. Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 137-144.

——, 1960: "Handeln und Leiden im Spiegel der Sprache", Forschungen und Fortschritte 34, 145-150.

——, 1961: "Zum Namen des Lachses", NGAW, Phil.-hist. Kl., 4, 83-98.

——, 1971: Tocharisch. Handbuch der Orientalistik, vierter Bd. Iranistik, dritter Abschnitt, Photomechanischer Nachdruck mit Zusätzen und Berichtigungen, Leiden/Köln: Brill.

Krisch, Thomas, 1996: Zur Genese und Funktion der altindischen Perfekta mit langem Reduplikationsvokal. Mit kommentierter Materialsammlung, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 87).

Krottenthaler, Robert, 1996: Die Jagd im alten Indien. Unter Berücksichtigung des mṛgayāvinoda-Kapitels im Mānasollāsa, Frankfurt am Main etc.: Lang.

Kümmel, Martin, 2000: Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

——, 2004: "Zur o-Stufe im idg. Verbalsystem", *Indo-European Word Formation. Proceedings of the Conference held at the University of Copenhagen October 20th – 22nd 2000*, ed. by James Clackson and Birgit Anette Olsen, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 139-158.

——, 2009: "The range of Tocharian *a*-umlaut", *Internal Reconstruction in Indo-European. Methods, results, and problems. Section Papers from the XVI International Conference on Historical Linguistics, University of Copenhagen, 11th–15th August, 2003*, ed. by Jens Elmegård Rasmussen et al., Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 171-179.

Kuiper, Franciscus B. J., 1934: "Zur Geschichte der indogermanischen *s*-Präsentia", Acta Orientalia 12, 190-306.

——, 1937: Die indogermanischen Nasalpräsentia. Ein Versuch zu einer morphologischen Analyse, Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij.

Kulikov, Leonid, 2001: The Vedic -*ya*-presents. Univ. Leiden.

Kuryłowicz, Jerzy, 1949: "La nature des procès dits 'analogiques'", Acta Linguistica 5, 15-37 = Kuryłowicz, 1973, 66-86.

——, 1966: "A Problem of Germanic Alliteration", *Studies in language and literature in honour of Margaret Schlauch*, ed. by Mieczysław Brahmer et al., Warszawa: PWN, 195-201 = Kuryłowicz, 1975, 388-394.

——, 1973: *Esquisses linguistiques*, 2. ed., München: Fink (Internationale Bibliothek für Allgemeine Linguistik 16).

——, 1975: *Esquisses linguistiques II*, München: Fink (Internationale Bibliothek für Allgemeine Linguistik 37).

LALIES 7: *LALIES. Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature 7 (Aussois, 27 août – 1er septembre 1985)*, Paris: École Normale Supérieure 1989.

Lane, George S., 1938: "Problems of Tocharian Phonology", Lg 14, 20-38 = Arndt, 1967, 3-26.

——, 1947: "The Tocharian Puṇyavantajātaka: Text and Translation", JAOS 67, 33-53.

——, 1948: Review of Pedersen, 1941 in: Lg 24, 298-310.

——, 1952: Studies in Kuchean Grammar I. Declension of Nouns, Adjectives, and Pronouns, JAOS, Suppl. 15.

——, 1953: Review of WTG in: Lg 29, 483-497.

——, 1953a: "Imperfect and Preterit in Tocharian", Lg 29, 278-87 = Arndt, 1967, 44-58.

——, 1959: "The formation of the Tocharian subjunctive", Lg 35, 157-179.

——, 1960: "The Indo-European Labiovelars in Tocharian", *Indogermanica. Festschrift für Wolfgang Krause zum 65. Geburtstage am 18. September 1960*, Heidelberg: Winter, 72-79.

——, 1962: "Tocharian Evidence and the Trubetzkoy-Benveniste Hypothesis", Lg 38, 245-253 = Arndt, 1967, 61-75.

——, 1965: "The Tocharian Verbal Stems in *-tk-*", JAOS 85, 66-73 = Arndt, 1967, 88-104.

——, 1970: "Tocharian: Indo-European and Non-Indo-European Relationships", *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans. Papers Presented at the Third Indo-European Conference at the University of Pennsylvania*, ed. by George Cardona et al., Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 73-88.

——, 1976: "Notes sur le sort des syllabes finales i.e. en tokharien", BSL 71, 133-159.

Lazzeroni, Romano, 1990: "La diatesi come categoria linguistica: studio sul medio indoeuropeo", SSL 30, 1-22 = *Scritti Scelti di Romano Lazzeroni*, a cura di Tristano Bolelli e Saverio Sani, Pisa: Pacini Editore 1997, 53-71.

——, 1993: "L'espressione dell'agente come categoria linguistica. I nomi indoeuropei in *-tér/-tor*", SSL 32, 1992[1993], 233-245.

——, 2002: "Transitivi, causativi e incoativi nel sistema verbale vedico", Incontri Linguistici 25, 105-122.

——, 2003: "Inaccusatività indoeuropea e alternanza causativa vedica", *Studi e Saggi Linguistici. Atti del Convegno di Studi in memoria di Tristano Bolelli. Pisa, 28–29 novembre 2003*, a cura di Giovanna Marotta, Pisa: ETS (L'Ialia Dialettale, N.S. XL-XLI, 2002-2003), 165-171.

——, 2004: "Inaccusatività indoeuropea e alternanza causativa vedica", AGI 89/2, 139-164.

Leumann, Ernst, 1900: "Über eine von den unbekannten Literatursprachen Mittelasiens", Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg, VIIIe série, IV/8, 1-28.

Levet, Jean-Pierre, 1975: "Les présents en *-*st*- de l'indo-européen: les données tokhariennes", BSL 70, 91-114.

——, 1991: "Étymologie et formation du verbe proto-indo-européen: remarques sur les désinences -*ṣ* et -*s* du tokharien A", *Studia Etymologica Indoeuropaea. Memoriae A.J. Van Windekens (1915-1989) dicata*, ed. Lambert Isebaert, Leuven: Peeters (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 45), 161-176.

Lévi, Sylvain, 1912: "Une légende du Karuṇā-Puṇḍarīka en langue tokharienne", *Festschrift Vilhelm Thomsen zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 25. Januar 1912*, dargebracht v. Freunden und Schülern, Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 155-165.

——, 1913: "Le "Tokharien", langue de Koutcha", JA, 11ᵉ série, tome II (septembre-octobre), 311-380.

——, 1933: Fragments de textes koutchéens. Udānavarga, Udānastotra, Udānālaṁkāra et Karmavibhaṅga, publiés et traduits avec un vocabulaire et une introduction sur le «tokharien» par M. Sylvain Lévi, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

——, 1936: "On a Tantrik Fragment from Kucha (Central Asia)", Indian Historical Quaterly 12, 197-214.

Lévi, Sylvain/Meillet, Antoine, 1912: "Remarques sur les formes grammaticales de quelques textes en tokharien B [I. Formes verbales.]", MSL 18/1, 1-33.

——, 1912a: "Les nomes des nombre en tokharien B", MSL 17, 281-294.

——, 1913: "Remarques sur les formes grammaticales de quelques textes en tokharien B (suite et fin.) [II. Formes nominales.]", MSL 18/6, 381-421.

Levin, Beth/Rappaport Hovav, Malka, 1995: Unaccusativity. At the Syntax-Lexical Semantic Interface, Cambridge, Mass./London: MIT Press (Linguistic Inquiry Monogr.s 26).

Lindeman, Fredrik Otto, 1969: "Zur Reduplikation beim Verbum im Tocharischen", Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap 23, 15-24 = *Studies in Comparative Indo-European Linguistics. Presented on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday March 3, 1996*, ed. by Helge Lødrup and Inger Moen, Oslo: Novus 1996, 68-75.

——, 1972: "Bemerkungen zu dem tocharischen *s*-Präteritum", Sprache 18, 44-48.

——, 1987: "Tocharian and the Laryngeal Theory", KZ 100, 297-303.

——, 2001: "On the origin of the Vedic type in -*an-yá-*", HS 114, 43-54.

Loporcaro, Michele, 1997: L'origine del Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico. Saggio di fonologia diacronica romanza. Basel: Francke.

Lubotsky, Alexander, 1985: "The PIE word for 'dry'", KZ 98, 1-10.

——, 1988: "Tocharian A *ṣurm*, B *ṣarm* "cause" and A *ṣul*, B *ṣale* "mountain"", TIES 2, 89-95.

——, 1994: "The original paradigm of the Tocharian word for 'king'", *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 4), 66-72.

——, 2004: "Avestan *siiazd-*, Sanskrit *sedh-*, Latin *cēdere*", *Per Aspera ad Asteriscos. Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii idibus Martiis anno MMIV*, ed. by Adam Hyllested et al., Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 112), 323-332.

Lühr, Rosemarie, 1984: "Reste der athematischen Konjugation in den germanischen Sprachen: zu 'sein' und 'tun'", *Das Germanische und die Rekonstruktion der indogermanischen Grundsprache. Akten des Freiburger Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Freiburg 26.–27. Februar 1981*, hg. v. Jürgen Untermann und Bela Brogyanyi, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins (Amsterdam Studies in Theory and History of Linguistic Science 22), 25-90.

Magnien, Victor, 1912: Le futur grec. Tome II. Emplois et origines, Paris: Champion.

Mallory, J.P./Adams, D.Q., 2006: The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Malzahn, Melanie, 2000: "Die nominalen Flexionsendungen des idg. Duals", HS 112/2, 1999[2000], 204-226.

——, 2004: "Toch. B *yesti nāskoy* und der Narten-Charakter der idg. Wurzel *u̯es* '(Kleidung) anhaben'", Sprache 43, 2002-2003[2004], 212-220.

——, 2005: „Westtocharische Substantive auf *-au* und einige Fortsetzer von idg. *men*-Stämmen im Tocharischen", *Indogermanica. Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt. Indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien dem verehrten Jubilar dargebracht zu seinem fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag*, hg. v. Günter Schweiger, Taimering: Schweiger VWT, 389-407.

——, 2007: "Tocharian desire", *Verba Docenti. Studies in historical and Indo-European linguistics presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by students, colleagues, and friends*, ed. by Alan J. Nussbaum, Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave Press, 237-249.

——, 2007a: "The most Archaic Manuscripts of Tocharian B and the Varieties of the Tocharian B Language", *Instrumenta Tocharica*, ed. by Melanie Malzahn, Heidelberg: Winter, 255-297.

——, 2007b: "A Preliminary Survey of the Tocharian Glosses in the Berlin Turfan Collection", *Instrumenta Tocharica*, ed. by Melanie Malzahn, Heidelberg: Winter, 301-319.

——, 2007c: "Bruchstück einer Sanskritgrammatik aus Ostturkestan in westtocharischer Sprache", ZDMG 157/2, 373-383.

——, 2007d: "Tocharian Texts and Where to Find them", *Instrumenta Tocharica*, ed. by Melanie Malzahn, Heidelberg: Winter, 79-112.

——, 2009: "Ein singulärer Fall von verbalem Ablaut im Tocharischen?", TIES 11, 63-72.

——, in print: "Verbale Rektionskomposita im Tocharischen", *Iranistische und indogermanistische Beiträge in memoriam Jochem Schindler (1944-1994)*, hg. v. Velizar Sadovski et al., Wien: Verlag d. ÖAW.

——, in print a: "Tocharian *säl-* 'fly' — a case of anticipatory palatalization", *Proceedings of the conference dedicated to the 100th anniversary of the*

deciphering of Tokharian texts on the 25th—30nd August 2008, *Moscow*, Studia Orientalia et classica, RSUH.

——, in print b: "Maitreya's rebirth and the encounter between philology and linguistics", *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen und die alttürkische Maitrisimit. Symposium anläßlich des 100. Jahrestages der Entzifferung des Tocharischen.*

——, in print c: "Die tocharischen Präsens- und Konjunktivstämme auf suffixales *-sk-* und eine innertocharische Vokalschwächungsregel", *Akten der 13. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, Salzburg, 21. – 27. Sept. 2008.

Malzahn, Melanie/Peters, Martin, forthc.: "How (not) to compare Tocharian and Ancient Greek verbal stems", to appear in a forthcoming Festschrift.

Marggraf, Wolf-Jürgen, 1970: Untersuchungen zum Akzent in Tocharisch B, Univ. Kiel.

——, 1975: "Bemerkungen zur historischen Phonologie und Morphologie einiger "primärer" Kasusmorpheme in Tocharisch B", *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.–14. September 1973*, hg. v. Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 198-203.

Marotta, Giovanna, 2008: "Lenition in Tuscan Italian (Gorgia Toscana)", *Lenition and Fortition*, ed. by Joaquim Brandão de Carvalho et al., Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (Studies in Generative Grammar 99), 235-271.

Mathiassen, Terje, 1974: Studien zum slavischen und indoeuropäischen Langvokalismus, Oslo, etc.: Universitetsforlaget.

Matzinger, Joachim, 2006: *Der altalbanische Text [E] Mbsuame e Krështerë (Dottrina cristiana) des Lekë Matrënga von 1592. Eine Einführung in die albanische Sprachwissenschaft*, Dettelbach: Röll (Jenaer indogermanische Textbearbeitung 3).

Maue, Dieter, 2009: "Uigurisches in Brahmī in nicht-uigurischen Brahmī-Handschriften", Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung. 62, 1-36.

Mayrhofer, Manfred, 1986: Lautlehre. Segmentale Phonologie des Indogermanischen, Indogermanische Grammatik, Bd. I, 2. Halbband, Heidelberg: Winter.

McCone, Kim, 2006: The Origins and Development of the Insular Celtic Verbal Complex, Maynooth: The Department of Old Irish, National University of Ireland (Maynooth Studies in Celtic Linguistics VI).

Meillet, Antoine, 1911: "Étude des documents tokhariens de la mission Pelliot. Remarques linguistique", JA 17, 449-464.

——, 1930: "Observations sur l'étymologie de l'arménien", REA 10, 183-186 = Études de linguistique et de philologie arméniennes II, Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste 1977, 266-269.

Meiser, Gerhard, 2003: Veni, Vidi, Vici. Die Vorgeschichte des lateinischen Perfektsystems, München: C. H. Beck.

Melchert, H. Craig, 1978: "Tocharian verb stems in *-tk-*", KZ 91, 1977[1978], 93-130.

——, 1983: "A 'New' PIE *men suffix", Sprache 29, 1-26.

——, 1984: Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (KZ Erg.-Heft 32).

——, 1994: Anatolian Historical Phonology, Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3).

——, 2000: "Tocharian Plurals in -nt- and Related Phenomena", TIES 9, 53-75.

——, 2000a: Review of Hackstein, 1995 in: TIES 9, 145ff.

Méndez Dosuna, Julián, 1993: "On ⟨Z⟩ for ⟨Δ⟩ in Greek dialectal inscriptions", Die Sprache 35,1, 1991-1993[1993], 82-114.

——, 1994: "Contactos silábicos y procesos de geminación en griego antiguo. A propósito de las variantes dialectales oρρος (át. ὄρος) y Κορρα (át. Κόρη)", Sprache 36, 103-127.

——, 1999: "La valeur de l'optatif oblique grec: un regard fonctionnel-typologique", Les Complétives en Grec Ancien. Actes du colloque international de Saint-Etienne (3–5 septembre 1998), Textes réunis et présentés par Bernard Jacquinod, Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne (Centre Jean-Palerne CNRS GDR 1038, Mémoires XVIII), 331-352.

——, 2006: "Impératifs actifs anticausatifs: παῦε, ἔγειρε", Word Classes and Related Topics in Ancient Greek. Proceedings of the Conference on 'Greek Syntax and Word Classes' held in Madrid on 18–21, June 2003, ed. by E. Crespo et al., Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters (Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain 117), 291-312.

——, 2007: "Ex praesente lux", Die altgriechischen Dialekte. Wesen und Werden. Akten des Kolloquiums Freie Universität Berlin 19.–22. September 2001, hg. v. Ivo Hajnal, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachen und Literaturen (IBS 126), 355-383.

Mottausch, Karl-Heinz, 1993: "Zwei verkannte germanisch-italische Isoglossen", HS 106, 148-175.

Müller, Friedrich Wilhelm Karl/Sieg, Emil, 1916: "Maitrisimit und »Tocharisch«", SPAW, 395-417.

Müller, Stefan, 2007: Zum Germanischen aus laryngaltheoretischer Sicht. Mit einer Einführung in die Grundlagen der Laryngaltheorie, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Narrog, Heiko, 2004: "From transitive to causative in Japanese", Diachronica 21, 351-392.

Narten, Johanna, 1964: Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

——, 1993: "Ved. stanáyati, gr. στένω etc.: idg. 'donnern' und 'stöhnen'", Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag, hg. v. Gerhard Meiser, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 72), 314-339 = 1995, 396-421.

——, 1995: Kleine Schriften, Bd. 1, hg. v. Marcos Albino u. Matthias Fritz, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Neri, Sergio, 2007: *Cadere* e *abbattere* in indoeuropeo. Sull' etimologia di tedesco *fallen*, latino *aboleo* e greco ἀπόλλυμι, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 124).

Nikolaev, Alexander, 2005: "Toχ. A *śamantär* и индоевропейский претерит с продленной ступенью аблаута в корне (Tocharian A *śamantär* and Indo-European preterits with a lengthened grade vowel in the root)", Voprosy Jazykoznanija, 68-83; available at:
http://sites.google.com/site/alexandersnikolaev/Home/publications-1

Norman, K.R., 2001: The Pātimokkha, ed. by William Pruitt, trans. by K.R. Norman, Oxford: Pali Text Society (PTS 49).

Normier, Rudolf, 1980: "Tocharisch *ñkät/ñakte* 'Gott'", KZ 94, 251-281.

Nussbaum, Alan J., 1976: Caland's "Law" and the Caland System. Ph.D. thesis Harvard University.

——, 2002: "Homeric OPHAI (Od. 14.343) and OMEITAI (Il. 9.274): Two of a Kind?", Colby Quarterly 38/2, 175-196.

Oettinger, Norbert, 1979: Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums, Nürnberg: Hans Carl (Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft Bd. 64 = überarbeiteter Nachdruck Dresden: Verlag d. TU 2002).

——, 1984: "Zur Diskussion um den lateinischen $\bar{a}$-Konjunktiv", Glotta 62, 187-201.

——, 1985: "Thematische Verbklassen des Hethitischen: Umlaut und Ablaut beim Themavokal", *Grammatische Kategorien. Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Berlin, 20.–25. Februar 1983*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath unter Mitarbeit von Veronica Rittner, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 296-312.

——, 1992: "Die hethitischen Verbalstämme", *Per una grammatica ittita. Towards a Hittite Grammar*, a cura di Onofrio Carruba, Pavia: Gianni Iuculano (Studia Mediterranea 7), 213-252.

——, 1993: "Zur Funktion des indogermanischen Stativs", *Indogermanica et Italica. Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Gerhard Meiser, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 72), 347-361.

——, 2006: Review of Jasanoff, 2003 in: Kratylos 51, 34-45.

——, 2007: "Der hethitische Imperativ auf *-i* vom Typ *paḫši* ‚schütze!'", *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Detlev Groddek u. Marina Zorman, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 25), 561-568.

Olsen, Birgit Anette, 1999: The Noun in Biblical Armenian, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (TLSM 119).

Palidoni, Anne-Lise, 2007: "Les arbres sacrés représentés dans les peintures de Dunhuang: la shorée robuste ou *śāla*", *Études de Dunhuang et Turfan*, éd. Jean-Pierre Drège, Genève : Droz (EPHE, Hautes études orientales 41), 129-154.

Pedersen, Holger, 1941: Tocharisch vom Gesichtspunkt der indoeuropäischen Sprachvergleichung, København: Ejnar Munksgaard (Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser XXVIII, 1).

——, 1943: "Tocharische Beiträge", REIE 3, 17-19.

——, 1944: Zur tocharischen Sprachgeschichte, København: Ejnar Munksgaard (Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser XXX, 2)

Penney, J. H. W., 1978: "The treatment of Indo-European vowels in Tocharian", TPS 1976-1977[1978], 66-91.

——, 1989: "Preverbs and Postpositions in Tocharian", TPS 87, 54-74.

——, 1998: Review of Hackstein, 1995 in: Kratylos 43, 92-96.

Perlmutter, David M., 1978: "Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusativity Hypothesis", *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistic Society, Univ. of California, 157-189.

Peters, Martin, 1975: "Altpersisch *ašiyava*", Sprache 21, 37-42.

——, 1980: Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen, Wien: Verlag d. ÖAW (SbÖAW 377).

——, 1991: "Ein tocharisches Auslautproblem", Sprache 34, 1988-1990[1991], 242-244.

——, 1991a: "Indogermanische Chronik 34", Sprache 34, 1988-1990[1991], 253-1027.

——, 1994: "Indogermanische Chronik 35, Teil I", Sprache 36/3.

——, 1997: "Der armenische Flexionstyp *gitem*, *gitac̣i* und das ion.-att. Plusquamperfekt", *Sound law and analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S.P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, ed. by Alexander Lubotsky, Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 9), 209-217.

——, 1999: "Gall(o-lat). *marcosior*", *Studia Celtica et Indogermanica. Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 70. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Peter Anreiter u. Erzsébet Jerem, Budapest: Archaeolingua, 305-314.

——, 2002: "Indogermanische Chronik 35. Dritter und letzter Teil", Sprache, 39/3, Chronicalia Indoeuropaea 39, 1997[2002], 94-129.

——, 2004: "Mögliche Reflexe einer Interaktion hoher und niederer Phonostile im Tocharischen", *Per Aspera ad Asteriscos. Studia Indogermanica in honorem Jens Elmegård Rasmussen sexagenarii idibus Martiis anno MMIV*, ed. by Adam Hyllested et al., Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 112), 429-446.

——, 2004a: "On some Greek *nt*-Formations", *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, ed. by J.H.W. Penney, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 266-276.

——, 2006: "Zur morphologischen Einordnung von messapisch *klaohi*", *Studi di antichità linguistiche in memoria di Ciro Santoro*, a cura di Maria Teresa Laporta, Bari: Cacucci, 329-353.

——, 2007: "οὐκ ἀπίθησε und πιθήσας", *Verba Docenti. Studies in historical and Indo-European linguistics presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by students, colleagues, and friends*, ed. by Alan J. Nussbaum, Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave Press, 263-270.

——, forthc.: Studien zum griechischen und indogermanischen Verbum (unpublished manuscript).

Petersen, Walter, 1933: "Hittite and Tocharian", Lg 9, 12-34.

Peyrot, Michaël, 2007: An edition of the Tocharian fragments IOL Toch 1 – IOL Toch 822 in the India Office Library, London, IDP. At: http://idp.bl.uk

——, 2007a: Review of Saito, 2006 in: Bibliotheca Orientalis 64/5-6, 798-801.

——, 2008: Variation and change in Tocharian B, Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 15).

——, 2008a: "More Sanskrit – Tocharian B bilingual Udānavarga fragments", IF 113, 83-125.

——, in print: "Gab es eine tocharische Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā?", *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen und die alttürkische Maitrisimit. Symposium anläßlich des 100. Jahrestages der Entzifferung des Tocharischen.*

——, in print a: "Semantic and etymological difficulties in Tocharian", *Proceedings of the conference dedicated to the 100th anniversary of the deciphering of Tokharian texts on the 25th–30nd August 2008*, Moscow.

Pike, Moss, 2009: "The Indo-European long-vowel preterite: new Latin evidence", *Internal Reconstruction in Indo-European. Methods, results, and problems. Section Papers from the XVI International Conference on Historical Linguistics, University of Copenhagen, 11th–15th August, 2003*, ed. by Jens Elmegård Rasmussen et al., Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 205-212.

Pinault, Georges-Jean, 1982: "A neglected phonetic law: the reduction of the Indo-European laryngeals in internal syllable before yod", *Papers from the 5th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, ed. by Anders Ahlqvist, Amsterdam: Benjamins (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Sciences 21), 265-72.

——, 1984: "Un fragment du *Vinayavibhaṅga* en Koutchéen", JA 272, 369-93.

——, 1984a: "Une lettre de monastère du fonds Pelliot Koutchéen", Revue de la Bibliothèque Nationale 11, 21-33.

——, 1984b: "Fragment d'un drame bouddhique en Koutchéen", BEI 2, 163-191.

——, 1984c: "Benveniste et le Tokharien", *E. Benveniste aujourd'hui. Actes du colloque international du CNRS, Université François Rabelais, Tours, 28 – 30 septembre 1983, tome II*, éd. Jean Taillardat et al., Louvain: Peeters, 109-124.

——, 1987: "Épigraphie koutchéenne. I. Laissez-passer de caravanes. II. Graffites et inscriptions", *Sites divers de la région de Koutcha*, par Chao Huashan et al., Paris: Collège de France, 59-196.

——, 1987a: "Notes d'onomastique koutchéenne", TIES 1, 77-97.

——, 1988: "Le Pratītyasamutpāda en koutchéen", TIES 2, 96-165.

——, 1988a: "Révision des fragments en tokharien B de la légende de Mahāprabhāsa", *Studia Indogermanica et Slavica. Festgabe für Werner Thomas zum 65. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Peter Kosta et al., München: Sagner, 175-210.

——, 1989: "Introduction au tokharien", *LALIES VII. Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature (Aussois, 27 août – 1ᵉʳ septembre 1985)*, Paris: École Normale Supérieure, 5-224.

——, 1989a: "Une version koutchéenne de l'Aggañña-sutta", TIES 3, 149-220.

——, 1990: "Notes sur les manuscrits de *Maitreyasamiti*", TIES 4, 119-202.

——, 1990a: "Compléments à l'*Udānālaṅkāra* et à l'*Udānastotra* en koutchéen", *Documents et archives provenant de l'Asie Centrale. Actes du Colloque Franco-Japonais, Kyoto, 4–8 octobre 1988*, éd. par †Akira Haneda, Kyoto: Association Franco-Japonaise des Études Orientales, 51-69.

——, 1990b: Review of Adams, 1988a in: BSL 85/2, 1990[1991], 75-90.

——, 1991: "Les manuscrits tokhariens et la littérature bouddhique en Asie centrale", CRAI 1991/1, 227-251.

——, 1991a: Review of Schmidt, 1989 in: Kratylos 36, 117-122.

——, 1992: Review of Thomas, 1990 in: BSL 87/2, 157-170.

——, 1994: "Formes verbales nouvelles dans les manuscrits inédit du fonds Pelliot Koutchéen", *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 4), 105-205.

——, 1994a: "Une nouvelle inscription koutchéenne de Qumtura: Légende de scènes bouddhiques de Praṇidhi", BEI 11-12, 1993-1994, 71-220.

——, 1994b: "Aspects du bouddhisme pratiqué au nord du désert du Taklamakan, d'après les documents tokhariens", *Bouddhisme et cultures locales. Quelques cas de réciproques adaptations. Actes du colloque franco-japonais de septembre 1991*, éd. par Fukui Fumimasa, Gérard Fussman, Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient (Études Thématiques 2), 85-113.

——, 1994c: "Lumières tokhariennes sur l'indo-européen", *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, unter Mitwirkung von Benedicte Nielsen hg. v. Jens Elmegård Rasmussen, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 365-396.

——, 1995: "Préhistoire de tokharien B *yṣuwar*", *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume. Part One*, ed. by Wojciech Smoczyński, Cracow: Universitas (Analecta Indoeuropaea Cracoviensia II), 191-205.

——, 1995a: "Observations sur de(ux) nouveaux documents tokhariens", Handout from the *Arbeitstagung Tocharologie*, Saarbrücken, 13.10.1995, 10pp.

——, 1997: "Nouvelle lecture du fragment A 270 du *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka*", TIES 7, 121-141.

——, 1997a: "Remarque sur le pluriel tokh. B *akrūna*, A *ākruṇt*", *Sound law and analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S.P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60ᵗʰ birthday*, ed. by Alexander Lubotsky, Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 9), 219-233.

——, 1997b: "Sur l'assemblage des phrases («Satzgefüge») en tokharien", *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy. Actas del Coloquio de la*

Indogermanische Gesellschaft Madrid, 21–24 de septiembre de 1994, ed. por Emilio Crespo y José Luis García Ramón, Madrid: Ediciones de la UAM/Wiesbaden: Reichert, 449-500.

——, 1997c: "Terminologie du petit bétail en tokharien", Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia 2, 175-218

——, 1998: "Economic and Administrative Documents in Tocharian B from the Berezovsky and Petrovsky Collections", Manuscripta Orientalia 4/4, 3-20.

——, 1998a: "Tocharian Languages and Pre-Buddhist Culture", *The Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Peoples of Western Central Asia. Vol. I, Archeology Migration and Nomadism, Linguistics*, ed. by Victor H. Mair, Washington: Institute for the Study of Man (JIES Monogr. 26), 358-371.

——, 1999: "Restitution du *Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka* en tokharien A: Bilan provisoire et recherches complémentaires sur l'acte XXVI", TIES 8, 189-240.

——, 1999a: "Tokharien A *kapśañi*, B *kektseñe*", *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*, hg. v. Heiner Eichner und Hans Christian Luschützky unter Mitarbeit v. Velizar Sadovski, Praha: enigma, 457-478.

——, 2000: "Nouveautés dans un commentaire de la Discipline bouddhique", TIES 9, 77-120.

——, 2000a: "Narration dramatisée et narration en peinture dans la région de Kucha", *La Sérinde, terre d'échanges. Art, religion, commerce du Ier au Xe siècle. Actes du colloque international (Galeries nationales du Grand Palais, 13-15 février 1996)*, publiées sous la direction de Jean-Pierre Drège, Paris: La Documentation française (XIVes rencontres de l'Ecole du Louvre), 149-168.

——, 2001: "Nouveautés lexicales et morphologiques dans le manuscrit de Yanqi du Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka en tokharien A", *Akten des 27. Deutschen Orientalistentages (Bonn — 28. September bis 2. Oktober 1998). Norm und Abweichung*, hg. v. Stefan Wild u. Hartmut Schild, Würzburg: Ergon, 121-136.

——, 2001a: "Tocharo-Turcica", *De Dunhuang à Istanbul. Hommage à James Russell Hamilton*, prés. par Louis Bazin et Peter Zieme, Turnhout: Brepols (Silk Road Studies 5), 245-265.

——, 2001b: "Remarques sur le fragment tokh. B 74 et sur quelques autres textes", Sprache 40, 1998[2001], 161-178.

——, 2002: "Tokh. B *k̰ucaññe*, A *k̰uciṃ* et skr. *tokharika*", IIJ 45, 311-345.

——, 2002a: "Tocharian and Indo-Iranian: relations between two linguistic areas", *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples*, ed. by Nicholas Sims-Williams, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press (Proceedings of the British Academy 116), 243-284.

——, 2004: "Zur indogermanischen Etymologie, besonders im zentralasiatischen Bereich", Handout eines auf dem 29. Deutschen Orientalistentages in Halle a. d. Saale am 23.9.2004 gehaltenen Vortrags.

——, 2004a: "Zum Tocharischen in der Turfanforschung", *Turfan Revisited — The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*,

ed. by Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst et al., Berlin: Reimer (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 17), 256-263.

——, 2005: "Impératif et exhortation en tokharien", *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*, hg. v. Gerhard Meiser und Olav Hackstein, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 495-523.

——, 2006: "Sur l'évolution phonétique *tsk* > *tk* en tokharien commun", MSS 62, 2002[2006], 103-156.

——, 2006a: "Morphologie de l'ablatif tokharien", *GIŠ.HURgul-za-at-ta-ra. Festschrift for Folke Josephson*, ed. by Gerd Carling, Göteborg: Meijerbergs institut (Meijerbergs Arkiv 32), 248-283.

——, 2006b: "Further links between the Indo-Iranian substratum and the BMAC language", *Themes and Tasks in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan Linguistics. Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference Held in Helsinki, Finland, 13–18 July 2003, vol. 5*, ed. by Bertil Tikkanen and Heinrich Hettrich, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 167-196.

——, 2006c: "Retour sur le numéral 'un' en tokharien", IF 111, 71-97.

——, 2007: "Concordance des manuscrits tokhariens du fonds Pelliot", *Instrumenta Tocharica*, ed. by Melanie Malzahn, Heidelberg: Winter, 163-219.

——, 2008: Chrestomathie tokharienne. Textes et Grammaire, Leuven/Paris: Peeters.

——, 2008a: "Bilingual hymn to Mani", *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages XXIII. Papers in Honour of Professor Takao Moriyasu on His 60th Birthday*, 93-120.

——, 2008b: "Tocharian Friendship", *Evidence and Counter-Evidence. Essays in honour of Frederik Kortlandt*, Vol. I: *Balto-Slavic and Indo-European Linguistics*, ed. by Alexander Lubotsky et al., Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi (Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics 32), 431-451.

——, 2009: "*Elephant Man.* Sur le nom de l'éléphant en tokharien", *Penser, dire et représenter l'animal dans le monde indien*, éd. par Nalini Balbir et Georges-Jean Pinault, Paris: Champion, 447-498.

——, in print: "Éléments d'analyse linguistique des fragments bilingues du *Yogaśataka*", TIES.

——, in print a: "Der Beitrag der alttürkischen *Maitrisimit* zur Interpretation der tocharischen Paralleltexte", *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen und die alttürkische Maitrisimit. Symposium anläßlich des 100. Jahrestages der Entzifferung des Tocharischen.*

Praust, Karl, 2000: Studien zum indogermanischen Verbum, Univ. Münster.

——, 2004: "Zur historischen Beurteilung von griech. κλίνω, der altindischen 9. Präsensklasse und zur Frage grundsprachlicher „*ni*-Präsentien"", *Artes et Scientiæ. Festschrift für Ralf-Peter Ritter zum 65. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Peter Anreiter et al., Wien: Edition Praesens, 369-390.

Pruden, Leo M., 1990: Abhidharmakośabhāṣya, by Louis de La Vallée Poussin, English Translation by Leo M. Pruden, Berkeley, Calif.: Asian Humanities Press.

Puhvel, Jaan, 1991: Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 3: Words beginning with H, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 5).

——, 2004: Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 6: Words beginning with M, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 22).

Rasmussen, Jens Elmegård, 1978: "Zur Morphophonemik des Urindogermanischen", *Collectanea Indoeuropaea I*, ed. by Bojan Čop, Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, 59-143.

——, 1988: "Tocharian B *oṅkolmo*, A *oṅkaläm* "elephant": an etymological suggestion", TIES 2, 166-183.

——, 1989: Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 55).

——, 1990: "Zur Ablauthierarchie des Nasalpräsens — vornehmlich im Arischen und Griechischen", *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 13. bis 15. Oktober 1988 in Basel*, hg. v. Heiner Eichner und Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 188-201.

——, 1992: "Miscellaneous morphological problems in Indo-European languages V", CWPL 2, 91-117 = Rasmussen, 1999, 551-573.

——, 1996: "Miscellaneous morphological problems in Indo-European languages VI", CWPL 4, 175-187 = Rasmussen, 1999, 608-618.

——, 1997: "Aus der Problematik der verbalen Stammbildung des Tocharischen", TIES 7, 143-153.

——, 1999: *Selected Papers on Indo-European Linguistics. With a Section on Comparative Eskimo Linguistics, Part 1-2*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum (Copenhagen Studies in Indo-European 1).

——, 2002: "The Slavic Verbal Type *bъrati* and some Key Issues of the Verbal System of Indo-European and Tocharian", *The Linguist's Linguist: A Collection of Papers in Honour of Alexis Manaster Ramer, Vol. II*, ed. by Fabrice Cavoto, München: Lincom, 373-386.

——, 2006: "Miscellaneous Problems in Indo-European Languages VIII", [GIŠ.HUR]*gul-za-at-ta-ra. Festschrift for Folke Josephson*, ed. by Gerd Carling, Göteborg: Meijerbergs institut (Meijerbergs Arkiv 32), 59-67.

Repetti, Lori, 1991: "A moraic analysis of *raddoppiamento Fonosintattico*", Rivista di Linguistica 3/2, 307-330.

Ringe, Donald A., Jr., 1987: "A closer look at Tocharian *e* and *o* and the Indo-European mediopassive", TIES 1, 98-138.

——, 1987a: "On the prehistory of Tocharian B accent", *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985). Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University, June 6–9, 1985*, ed. by Calvert Watkins, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 254-269.

——, 1989: "The imperative prefix /pə-/ in the Tocharian B dialects", TIES 3, 51-63.

——, 1989a: "Tocharian B *ausu, auṣu, aultsu*", TIES 3, 35-50.

——, 1990: "The Tocharian active s-preterite", MSS 51, 183-242.

——, 1991: "Evidence for the Position of Tocharian in the Indo-European Family?", Sprache 34, 1988-1990[1991], 59-123.

——, 1991a: "Laryngeals and Sievers' law in Tocharian", MSS 52, 137-168.

——, 1996: On the Chronology of Sound Changes in Tocharian. Volume 1: From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Tocharian, New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society (AOS 80).

——, 2000: "Tocharian Class II Presents and Subjunctives and the Reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European Verb", TIES 9, 121-142.

——, 2003: "An early rule of syncope in Tocharian", *Language in Time and Space. A Festschrift for Werner Winter on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday*, ed. by Brigitte L. M. Bauer, Georges-Jean Pinault, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (TLSM 144), 359-362.

——, 2006: A Linguistic History of English. Vol. I. From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Rix, Helmut, 1977: "Das keltische Verbalsystem auf dem Hintergrund des indo-iranisch-griechischen Rekonstruktionsmodells", *Indogermanisch und Keltisch. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft am 16. und 17. Februar 1976 in Bonn*, hg. v. Karl Horst Schmidt, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 132-158.

——, 1990: Review of *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985). Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University, June 6–9, 1985*, ed. by Calvert Watkins, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter in: Kratylos 35, 41-48.

——, 1993: "Osk. *úpsannam – uppsens* und Zugehöriges", *Sprachen und Schriften des antiken Mittelmeerraums. Festschrift für Jürgen Untermann zum 65. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Frank Heidermanns et al., Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 78), 329-348.

——, 1998: "Eine neue frühsabellische Inschrift und der altitalische Präventiv", HS 111, 247-269.

Rose, Christian, 1980: "Tokh. B *ste*, *stare* et véd. *ā́sthat*, *ásthiran*", Travaux de linguistique indo-européenne (Bruxelles) 1, 72-73.

Rosen, Valentina, 1959: Der Vinayavibhaṅga zum Bikṣuprātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins. Sanskritfragmente nebst einer Analyse der chinesischen Übersetzung, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden II).

Ross, A.S.C./Crossland, R.A., 1954: "Supposed Use of the 2nd Singular for the 3rd Singular in "Tocharian A", Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Hittite", Archivum Linguisticum 6, 112-121.

Saito, Haruyuki, 1997: "On the origin of the reduplicated preterite in Tocharian", TIES 7, 155-161.

——, 2006: Das Partizipium Präteriti im Tocharischen, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Sander, Lore, 1994: "Tocharische Dokumente im Museum für Indische Kunst, Berlin", *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 4), 93-104d.

——, in print: "Was kann die Paläographie zur Datierung tocharischer Handschriften beitragen", *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen und die alttürkische Maitrisimit. Symposium anläßlich des 100. Jahrestages der Entzifferung des Tocharischen.*

Schaefer, Christiane, 1997: "*waṣik͜ kalpaṣṣuki*. Zu den westtocharischen Nominalbildungen auf -*uki*", TIES 7, 163-176.

Schaffner, Stefan, 2006: "Altenglisch *umbor* 'Kind'", IJDL 3, 147-185.

Schindler, Jochem, 1967: "Tocharische Miszellen", IF 72, 239-249.

——, 1976: "On the Greek type ἱππεύς", *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics. Offered to Leonard R. Palmer on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday June 5, 1976*, ed. by Anna Morpurgo Davies and Wolfgang Meid, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 16), 349-352.

——, 1980: "Zur Geschichte der altindischen *cvi*-Bildungen", *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie. Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wien, 24.–29. September 1978*, hg. v. Manfred Mayrhofer et al., Wiesbaden: Reichert, 386-393.

Schmid, W. P., 1963: Studien zum baltischen und indogermanischen Verbum, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Schmidt, Gernot, 1977: "Das Medium im vorhistorischen Keltisch", *Indogermanisch und Keltisch. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft am 16. und 17. Februar 1976 in Bonn*, hg. v. Karl Horst Schmidt, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 89-107.

——, 1982: "Griechisch -μην und der idg. Konjunktiv des Perfekts", *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Johann Tischler, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 40), 345-356.

——, 1984: "Got. standan, gaggan, iddja", Sprachwissenschaft 9, 211-230.

——, 1985: "Lateinisch *amāvī*, *amāstī* und ihre indogermanischen Grundlagen", Glotta 63, 52-92.

Schmidt, Karl Horst, 2007: Review of Celtica 24, 2004 in: IF 112, 316-320.

Schmidt, Klaus T., 1974: Die Gebrauchsweisen des Mediums im Tocharischen, Univ. Göttingen.

——, 1975: "Zu einigen Problemen der tocharischen Verbal- und Nominalflexion", *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.–14. September 1973*, hg. v. Helmut Rix, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 287-295.

——, 1980: "Zu Stand und Aufgaben der etymologischen Forschung auf dem Gebiete des Tocharischen", *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie. Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wien, 24.–29. September 1978*, hg. v. Manfred Mayrhofer et al., Wiesbaden: Reichert, 394-411.

——, 1980a: "Zu einer metrischen Übersetzung von Mātr̥ceṭas Buddhastotra Varṇārhavarṇa in osttocharischer Sprache", *XX. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 3. bis 8. Oktober 1977 in Erlangen*, hg. v. Wolfgang Voigt, Wiesbaden: Steiner (ZDMG Suppl. 4), 341-343.

——, 1982: "Spuren tiefstufiger seṭ-Wurzeln im tocharischen Verbalsystem", *Serta Indogermanica. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*,

hg. v. Johann Tischler, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 40), 363-372.

——, 1983: "Zum Verhältnis von Sanskritvorlage und tocharischer Übersetzung. Untersucht am Beispiel osttocharischer Stotratexte", *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien. Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli 1981*, hg. v. Klaus Röhrborn u. Wolfgang Veenker, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 16), 125-131.

——, 1983a: "Vorläufige Bemerkungen zu den in der Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin neu gefundenen tocharischen Handschriftenfragmenten", *XXI. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 24. bis 29. März 1980 in Berlin. Vorträge*, hg. v. Fritz Steppart, Wiesbaden: Steiner (ZDMG Suppl. 5), 271-279.

——, 1984: "Bericht über das Projekt eines sanskrit-tocharischen Wörterbuchs", KZ 97, 148-153.

——, 1985: "Beiträge zur Kenntnis der tocharischen Verbalmorphologie", *Grammatische Kategorien, Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, 20.–25. Februar 1983*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath unter Mitarbeit von Veronica Rittner, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 424-434.

——, 1985a: "Zu einigen der ältesten iranischen Lehnwörter im Tocharischen", *Studia Linguistica, Diachronica et Synchronica. Werner Winter sexagenario anno MCMLXXIII gratis animis ab eius collegis, amicis discipulisque oblata*, hg. v. Ursula Pieper u. Gerhard Stickel, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 757-767.

——, 1986: Fragmente eines buddhistischen Ordinationsrituals in westtocharischer Sprache. Aus der Schule der Sarvāstivādins. Text, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen und Indizes [unveröffentlichte Habilitationsschrift].

——, 1986a: "Bemerkungen zur westtocharischen Umgangssprache", *o-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Annemarie Etter, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 635-649.

——, 1987: "Zu einer metrischen Übersetzung von Mātr̥ceṭas Buddhastotra Varṇārhavarṇa in tocharischer Sprache", TIES 1, 152-168.

——, 1987a: "Zu einigen Archaismen in Flexion und Wortschatz des Tocharischen", *Studien zum indogermanischen Wortschatz*, hg. v. Wolfgang Meid, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 52), 287-300.

——, 1988: "Stellungsbedingte Konsonantisierung von ∂_2 im Tocharischen", *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*, hg. Alfred Bammesberger, Heidelberg: Winter, 471-480.

——, 1989: Der Schlußteil des Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins. Text in Sanskrit und Tocharisch A verglichen mit den Parallelversionen anderer Schulen, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden XIII).

——, 1989a: "Zur Vorgeschichte der tocharischen Nasalpräsentien", *Ausgewählte Vorträge. XXIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 16. bis 20. September 1985 in Würzburg*, hg. v. Einar von Schuler, Stuttgart: Steiner (ZDMG Suppl. 7), 303-313.

——, 1990: "Fragmente von Vasubandhus *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* aus Chinesisch-Turkestan", *XXIV. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 26. bis 30. September 1988 in Köln. Ausgewählte Vorträge*, hg. v. Werner Diem u. Abdoldjavad Falaturi, Stuttgart: Steiner (ZDMG Suppl. 8), 471-477.

——, 1992: "Archaismen des Tocharischen und ihre Bedeutung für Fragen der Rekonstruktion und der Ausgliederung", *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie. Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden, 31. August – 4. September 1987*, hg. v. Robert Beekes et al., Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 65), 101-112.

——, 1994a: "Zu Stand und Aufgaben der sprachwissenschaftlichen Erforschung des Tocharischen", *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 4), 207-237.

——, 1994b: "Zur Erforschung der tocharischen Literatur: Stand und Aufgaben", *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 4), 238-283.

——, 1995: "Ex oriente lux. Anhalspunkte für ursprünglich wurzelabstufende Nasalpräsentien im Tocharischen", *Verba et Structurae. Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Heinrich Hettrich et al., Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 83), 273-283.

——, 1996: "Das tocharische *Maitreyasamitināṭaka* im Vergleich mit der uigurischen *Maitrisimit*", *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang. Vorträge der Tagung "Annemarie v. Gabain und die Turfanforschung", veranstaltet von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (9. – 12.12.1994)*, hg. v. Ronald E. Emmerick et al., Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 269-278.

——, 1997: "Liebe und Sexualität im Spiegel der tocharischen Sprachzeugnisse", *Eros, Liebe und Zuneigung in der Indogermania. Akten des Symposiums zur indogermanischen Kultur- und Altertumskunde in Graz (29. – 30. September 1994)*, hg. v. Michaela Ofitsch, Graz: Leykam (Arbeiten aus der Abteilung "Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft" in Graz 11), 227-262.

——, 1997a: "Zu einigen Archaismen unter den tocharischen Präteritalbildungen", TIES 7, 255-261.

——, 1997b: "Problems of Recording Tocharian in Central Asian Brāhmī", *Languages and Scripts of Central Asia*, ed. by Shirin Akiner and Nicholas Sims-Williams, London: SOAS, University of London, 16-24.

——, 1997c: "Ex oriente lux II. Untersuchungen zum Fortleben der indogermanischen Wurzel * K̂leu- 'hören' im Tocharischen", *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy. Actas del Coloquio de la*

Indogermanische Gesellschaft Madrid, 21–24 de septiembre de 1994, ed. por Emilio Crespo y José Luis García Ramón, Madrid: Ediciones de la UAM/Wiesbaden: Reichert, 541-569.

——, 1999: "Tocharisch A *k̰u̇ciṃ* "aus Kučā stammend, kučisch"", MSS 59, 197-113.

——, 1999a: "Irrwege der Textinterpretation II. Zum Ansatz eines westtocharischen Verbums *mutk-* 1. "renforcer" ("verstärken"), 2. "fermer (la porte)"", MSS 59, 98-106.

——, 1999b: Review of Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998 in: TIES 8, 277-285.

——, 2000: "Wie zuverlässig sind unsere tocharischen Textausgaben? Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Editionen der *Tocharischen Sprachreste, Sprache B*, von E. Sieg, W. Siegling und W. Thomas und einigen weiteren westtocharischen Textstellen", Sprache 39, 1997[2000], 224-238.

——, 2000a: "Ein bisher verkanntes Nasalinfixpräsens im Vedischen", *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1997 in Erlangen*, hg. v. Bernhard Forssman u. Robert Plath, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 507-514.

——, 2001: "Die westtocharische Version des Araṇemi-Jātakas in deutscher Übersetzung", *De Dunhuang à Istanbul. Hommage à James Russell Hamilton*, prés. par Louis Bazin et Peter Zieme, Turnhout: Brepols (Silk Road Studies 5), 299-327.

——, 2001a: Review of Ji/Winter/Pinault, 1998 in: Kratylos, 45, 73-80.

——, 2001b: "Interdisciplinary Research on Central Asia: The Decipherment of the West Tocharian Captions of a Cycle of Mural Paintings of the Life of the Buddha in Cave 110 in Qizil", Sprache 40, 1998[2001], 72-81.

——, 2001c: "Zeitenwende an der Seidenstrasse. Zur Sprachgeschichte des Westtocharischen nach der Schlacht von To-Ho (648 n. Chr.)", *Tempus edax rerum. Le bicentenaire de la Bibliothèque nationale de Luxembourg (1798-1998)*, textes réunis et édités par Luc Deitz, Luxembourg: Bibliothèque nationale, 151-162.

——, 2001d: "Entzifferung verschollener Schriften und Sprachen. Dargestellt am Beispiel der Kučā-Kharoṣṭhī Typ B und des Kučā-Prākrits", Göttinger Beiträge zur Asienforschung 1, 7-27 (+ Tafeln).

——, 2002: "Beobachtungen zur tocharischen Landwirtschaftsterminologie", Sprache 41, 1999[2002], 1-23.

——, 2004: "Indo-Tocharica. Die Bedeutung anderssprachiger Parallelversionen für die Erschließung des tocharischen Schrifttums", *Turfan Revisited — The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*, ed. by Desmond Durkin-Meistererernst et al., Berlin: Reimer (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 17), 310-312.

——, 2005: "Ex oriente lux III. Zur Vorgeschichte der tocharischen *-tk-*Präsentien", *Indogermanica. Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt. Indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien dem verehrten Jubilar dargebracht zu seinem fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag*, hg. v. Günter Schweiger, Taimering: Schweiger VWT, 557-559.

——, 2006: "THT 1539", *Jaina-Itihāsa-Ratna. Festschrift für Gustav Roth zum 90. Geburtstag*, hg. von Ute Hüsken et al., Marburg: Indica et Tibetica (Indica et Tibetica 47), 461-466.

——, 2007: "THT 1540", *Instrumenta Tocharica*, ed. by Melanie Malzahn, Heidelberg: Winter, 321-339.

——, 2008: "Westtocharische Überschriften zu den Praṇidhibildern der Ritterhöhle in Kiriš", *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek. Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Brigitte Huber et al., Halle a. d. Salle: IITBS, 513-524.

——, 2008a: "THT 107 „Die Speisung des Bodhisattva vor der Erleuchtung". Die westtocharische Version im Vergleich mit der Sanskritfassung der *Mūlasarvāstivādins*", *Aspects of research into Central Asian Buddhism. In memoriam Kōgi Kudara*, ed. by Peter Zieme, Turnhout: Brepols (Silk Road Studies 16), 309-342.

Schmidt, Klaus T./Strunk, Klaus, 1989: "Toch. B *kwǐpe* "Scham; Schande", A *kip* "Scham" und germ. **wība-* "Weib"", *Indogermania Europaea. Festschrift für Wolfgang Meid zum 60. Geburtstag am 12.11.1989*, hg. v. Karin Heller et al., Graz: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (Grazer Linguistische Monographien 4), 251-284.

Schmidt, Klaus T./Winter, Werner, 1992: "Die Formen der 1. Singular Aktiv der unerweiterten Präterita in Tocharisch B [recte A]", HS 105, 50-56 = Winter, 2005, 434-440.

Schneider, K., 1939: "Beiträge zur Wortkunde des Tocharischen", KZ 66, 249-253.

——, 1940: "Zur Wortkunde und Grammatik des Tocharischen", IF 57, 193-204.

——, 1941: "Beiträge zur tocharischen Wortkunde und Grammatik", IF 58, 37-50.

Schulze, Wilhelm, 1895: "Samstag", KZ 333, 366-386 = Schulze, 1934, 281-296.

——, 1924: "Die reduplizierten Präterita des Tocharischen und des Germanischen", SPAW, 166-174 = 1934, 239-248.

——, 1934: *Kleine Schriften*, hg. v. Indogermanischen Seminar der Universität Berlin, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Schumacher, Stefan, 2004: Die keltischen Primärverben. Ein vergleichendes, etymologisches und morphologisches Lexikon. Unter Mitarbeit von Britta Schulze-Thulin und Caroline aan de Wiel, Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 110).

——, 2005: "'Langvokalische Perfekta' in indogermanischen Einzelsprachen und ihr grundsprachlicher Hintergrund", *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*, hg. v. Gerhard Meiser und Olav Hackstein, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 591-626.

——, 2006: Review of Monica Genesin, Studio sulle formazioni di presente e aoristo del verbo albanese in: Sprache 46, 124-129.

——, 2007: "Kontinuanten urindogermanischer Wurzelaoriste im Albanischen. Teil 1: Wurzelaoriste mit frühalbanischem Stamm auf Vokal oder auf *ś", IJDL 4, 207-280.

Seržant, Ilja, 2007: "Bedeutung und Etymologie der tocharischen A Wurzel *tsän-*", HS 120, 105-109.

——, 2008: "Die idg. Wurzel *kelh₁- „etw. bewegen" und *kelh₃- „sich erheben"", IF 113, 59-75.

Shackleton Bailey, D.R., 1951: The Śatapañcāśatka of Mātṛceṭa. Sanskrit Text, Tibetan Translation & Commentary and Chinese Translation. With an Introduction, English Translation and Notes, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press 1951.

Sieg, Emil, 1937: "Und dennoch "Tocharisch"", SPAW, 130-139.

——, 1938: "Die Kutschischen Karmavibhaṅga-Texte der Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris", KZ 65, 1-54.

——, 1943: Review Van Windekens, 1941 in: OLZ 46, 131-138.

——, 1943a: Review of Van Windekens, 1940 in: OLZ 46, 160-161.

——, 1950: "Geschäftliche Aufzeichnungen in Tocharisch B aus der Berliner Sammlung", Miscellanea Academica Berlinensia, 208-223 (+ Taf. I-IV).

——, 1955: "Die medizinischen und tantrischen Texte der Pariser Sammlung in Tocharisch B", KZ 72, 63-83.

Sieg, Emil/Siegling, Wilhelm, 1925: "Die Speisung des Bodhisattva vor der Erleuchtung. Nach einem in Turfan gefundenen Handschriftenblatt in der B-Mundart des Tocharischen", Asia Major 2, 277-283.

——, 1932: "Udānavarga-Uebersetzungen in "Kucischer Sprache"", BSOAS 6, 1930-32, 483-499.

——, 1933: "Bruchstück eines Udānavarga-Kommentars (Udānālaṃkāra?) im Tocharischen", *Festschrift Moriz Winternitz 1863 – 23. December – 1933*, hg. v. Otto Stein u. Wilhelm Gampert, Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 167-173.

Simone, Carlo de, 1987: "Messapisch *no* „sum"", KZ 100, 135-145.

Simone, Carlo de/Marchesini, Simona, 2002: *Monumenta linguae Messapicae*, Vol. 2, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Simson, Georg von, 1986: Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins. Teil I. Wiedergabe bisher nicht publizierter Handschriften in Transkription, nach Vorarbeiten von Else Lüders† u. Herbert Härtel hg. v. Georg von Simson, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden XI).

——, 2000: Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins. Teil II. Kritische Textausgabe, Übersetzung, Wortindex sowie Nachträge zu Teil I, nach Vorarbeiten von Else Lüders† u. Herbert Härtel hg. v. Georg von Simson, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden XI)

Solmsen, Felix, 1901: Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laut- und Verslehre, Strassburg: Trübner.

Stang, Christian S., 1966: Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen, Oslo, etc.: Universitetsforlaget.

Stein, Aurel, 1928: Innermost Asia. Detailed report of explorations in Central Asia, Kan-su and Eastern Īrān, Oxford: Clarendon (4 vols.).

Steinbauer, Dieter Hubertus, 1989: Etymologische Untersuchungen zu den bei Plautus belegten Verben der lateinischen ersten Konjugation. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Denominative, Diss. Univ. Regensburg.

Stumpf, Peter, 1971: Der Gebrauch der Demonstrativ-Pronomina im Tocharischen, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

——, 1971a: "Der vokalische Sandhi im Tocharischen", KZ 85, 96-133.

——, 1990: Die Erscheinungsformen des Westtocharischen. Ihre Beziehungen zueinander und ihre Funktionen, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 2).

Syed, Renate, 1990: Die Flora Altindiens in Literatur und Kunst, Diss. Univ. München.

Tamai, Tatsushi, 2005: "Paläographische Untersuchung und C^{14}-Prüfung. Digitalisierung der chinesischen, tibetischen, syrischen und Sanskrit-Texte der Berliner Turfansammlung, 02. 06. 2005 – Berlin". At:
http://www.bbaw.de/bbaw/Forschung/Forschungsprojekte/turfanforsch ung/bilder/Tamai.pdf

——, 2007: An edition of the Tocharian fragments IOL Toch 853 – IOL Toch 1247 in the India Office Library, London, IDP. At: http://idp.bl.uk

——, 2007a: A preliminary edition of unpublished texts from the Berlin Turfan Collection, TITUS, Frankfurt am Main. At:
http://titus.fkidg1.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/tocharic/tht.htm

——, 2009: "The Tocharian fragments in Or.15004, Or.15009 and Or.150010 of the Hoernle Collection", *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia. The British Library Sanskrit Fragments*, Vol. II/1-2, ed. by Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille, 659-665.

Tekin, Şinasi, 1980: Maitrisimit nom bitig. Die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule. 1. Teil: Transliteration, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur des Alten Orients, Berliner Turfantexte IX).

Tichy, Eva, 2000: Indogermanistisches Grundwissen, Bremen: Hempen.

——, 2006: Der Konjunktiv und seine Nachbarkategorien. Studien zum indogermanischen Verbum, ausgehend von der älteren vedischen Prosa, Bremen: Hempen.

Thomas, Werner, 1952: Die tocharischen Verbaladjektive auf *-l*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Deutsche Akad. der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung 9).

——, 1953: "Ein tocharischer Liebesbrief", KZ 71, 78-80.

——, 1954: "Die Infinitive im Tocharischen", *Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller. Zum 65. Geburtstag*, gewidmet von seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern, Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 701-764.

——, 1957: Der Gebrauch der Vergangenheitstempora im Tocharischen, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

——, 1958: "Zum Gebrauch des prohibitiven *mar* bzw. *mā* im Tocharischen", CAJ 3, 289-308.

——, 1958a: "Zum Ausdruck der Komparation beim tocharischen Adjektiv", KZ 75, 129-169.

——, 1960: Review of von Gabain/Winter, 1958 in: Kratylos 5, 147-154.

——, 1965: "Das Fragment M 500, 4/5 der Sammlung Pelliot", KZ 79, 192-202.

——, 1966: "Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch von toch. A *yo* und B *waī*", CAJ 11, 264-274.

——, 1966a: "Tocharische Udānastotras der Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris", KZ 80, 163-181.

——, 1968: "Zur Verwendung von toch. A *oki*/B *ramt* und A *māṃtne*/B *mākte* in Vergleichen", Orbis 17, 198-231.

——, 1968a: "Zur tocharischen Übersetzung des Sanskrit-Udānavarga", KZ 82, 183-213.

——, 1969: "Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch von toch. A *ptañkät* [B *pañäkte*, *pudñäkte*], A *koṃ* [B *kauṃ*]: A *koṃñkät* [B *kauṃñäkte*] usw.", Orbis 18, 235-268.

——, 1969a: "Zur tocharischen Wiedergabe der Sanskrit-Verba des Udānavarga", KZ 83, 290-322.

——, 1969b: "Toch. B *pañäkti* Gen. Sg.?", Sprache 15, 53-58.

——, 1971: Bilinguale Udānavarga-Texte der Sammlung Hoernle, Mainz: Verlag d. Akad. d. Wissenschaften und d. Literatur (Abhandlungen d. Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1971, 7).

——, 1972: "Zweigliedrige Wortverbindungen im Tocharischen", Orbis 21, 429-470.

——, 1972a: "Zu den tocharischen Ekaśṛnga-Fragmenten", CAJ 16, 226-231.

——, 1973: "Zur Bedeutung des Tempuswechsels von Präteritum zu Präsens im Tocharischen", IF 78, 78-94.

——, 1974: "Zu einigen weiteren sanskrit-tocharischen Udānavarga-Fragmenten", KZ 88, 77-105.

——, 1977: "Ein weiteres tocharisches Udānavarga-Fragment", KZ 90, 104-113.

——, 1978: "Bemerkungen zu A. J. Van Windekens' Buch "Le tokharien"", IF 82, 1977[1978], 107-129.

——, 1979: "Zur Behandlung von inlautendem -*ä*- bzw. -*a*- in toch. B", IF 83, 1978[1979], 144-186.

——, 1979a: "Ein neues tocharisches Prātimokṣa-Fragment der Bibliothèque Nationale", KZ 99, 1978[1979], 235-268.

——, 1979b: Formale Besonderheiten in metrischen Texten des Tocharischen: Zur Verteilung von B *tane*/*tne* "hier" und B *ñake*/*ñke* "jetzt", Mainz: Verlag d. Akad. d. Wissenschaften und d. Literatur (Abhandlungen d. Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1979, 15).

——, 1983: Der tocharische Obliquus im Sinne eines Akkusativs der Richtung, Mainz: Verlag d. Akad. d. Wissenschaften und d. Literatur (Abhandlungen d. Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1983, 6).

——, 1984: "Bemerkungen zu A. J. Van Windekens' "Le tokharien" (Vol. II 1)", IF 88, 1983[1984], 204-226.

——, 1985: "Toch. B *tsamo* < *tsämāmo* ?", IF 90, 88-93.

——, 1985a: Die Erforschung des Tocharischen (1960-1984), Stuttgart: Steiner.

——, 1986: "Zur Stellung von toch. A *nuṃ*, B *nano* "wieder" innerhalb des Satzes", KZ 99, 117-146.

——, 1987: "Ein neues Pātayantika-Fragment in Toch. B", TIES 1, 169-191.

——, 1987a: "Bemerkungen zu dem Pariser Blatt AS 18 B in toch. B", IF 92, 85-94.

——, 1989: Probleme der Übertragung buddhistischer Texte ins Tocharische, Mainz: Verlag d. Akad. d. Wissenschaften und d. Literatur (Abhandlungen d. Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1989, 10).

——, 1990: Tocharische Maitreya-Parallelen aus Hami, Stuttgart: Steiner (SbWGF XXVII, 1).

——, 1991: Zwei weitere Maitreya-Fragmente in Tocharisch A, Stuttgart: Steiner (SbWGF XXVIII, 1).

——, 1991a: "Probleme der Wortforschung im Tocharischen", *Studia Etymologica Indoeuropaea. Memoriae A.J. Van Windekens (1915-1989) dicata*, ed. Lambert Isebaert, Leuven: Peeters (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 45), 295-304.

——, 1993: Parallele Texte im Tocharischen und ihre Bewertung, Stuttgart: Steiner (SbWGF XXX, 5).

——, 1997: Interpretationsprobleme im Tocharischen. Unflektiertes A *puk*, B *po* "ganz, all, jeder", Stuttgart: Steiner (SbWGF XXXV, 3).

——, 1999: "Zu einigen Besonderheiten im Tocharischen", *Florilegium Linguisticum. Festschrift für Wolfgang P. Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Eckhard Eggers et al., Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Lang, 469-478.

——, 2003: "Bemerkungen zu den "Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka"", IF 108, 305-329.

Þórhallsdóttir, Guðrún, 1988: "Tocharian contraction across -*w*-", TIES 2, 184-210.

Tremblay, Xavier, 2005: "Zum Narten-Aorist. Apophonica IV", *Indogermanica. Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt. Indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien dem verehrten Jubilar dargebracht zu seinem fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag*, hg. v. Günter Schweiger, Taimering: Schweiger VWT, 637-664.

——, 2005a: "Irano-Tocharica et Tocharo-Iranica", BSOAS 68, 421-449.

——, 2006: "Ist die Aktivendung 3Pl -*āra* in einigen ostiranischen Sprachen inneriranische Entwicklung oder indogermanisches Erbe? (mit einem Exkurs über die athematischen Endungen des Chwaresmischen). Beiträge zur Vergleichenden Grammatik der Iranischen Sprachen VI", MSS 62, 2002[2006], 259-287.

Tuttle, Edward F., 1991: "Nasalization in Northern Italy: Syllabic Constraints and Strength Scales as Developmental Parameters", Rivista di Linguistica 3/1, 23-92.

Vaan, Michiel de, 2008: Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages, Leiden/Boston: Brill (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 7).

Vendryes, J., 1911: "Sur quelques présents en -*ā*- du verbe italo-celtique", MSL 16, 1910-1911, 300-305.

Veselinova, Ljuba N., 2006: Suppletion in Verb Paradigms. Bits and pieces of the puzzle, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Vine, Brent, 1998: "The Etymology of Greek κώμη and Related Problems", *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, ed. by Jay Jasanoff et al., Innsbruck: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 92), 685-702.

——, 2007: "Latin *gemo* 'groan', Greek γέγωνε 'cry out', and Tocharian A *ken-*'call'", *Verba Docenti. Studies in historical and Indo-European linguistics presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by students, colleagues, and friends*, ed. by Alan J. Nussbaum, Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave Press, 343-357.

Villanueva Svensson, Miguel, 2003: La categoría de voz en el sistema verbal indoeuropeo, Univ. Madrid.

——, 2005: "The Baltic *ē*-preterit revisited", Baltistica 6, 239-252.

——, 2006: "Traces of *o-Grade Middle Root Aorists in Baltic and Slavic", HS 119, 295-317.

Wackernagel, Jacob, 1916: Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

——, 1920: Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch, Basel: Birkhäuser.

Waldschmidt, Ernst, 1932: Bruchstücke buddhistischer Sūtras aus dem zentralasiatischen Sanskritkanon. Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins, Leipzig: Brockhaus (Nachdruck Wiesbaden 1979: Steiner).

——, 1952-1962: Das Catuṣpariṣatsūtra, eine kanonische Lehrschrift über die Begründung der buddhistischen Gemeinde. Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, verglichen mit dem Pāli nebst einer Übersetzung der chinesischen Entsprechung im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins, auf Grund von Turfan-Handschriften hg. und bearb. von Ernst Waldschmidt, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (3 vol.).

——, 1955: "Zu einigen Bilinguen aus den Turfan-Funden", NGAW, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1, 1-20 = Waldschmidt, 1967, 238-257.

——, 1967: *Von Ceylon bis Turfan. Schriften zur Geschichte, Literatur, Religion und Kunst des indischen Kulturraumes. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag am 15. Juli 1967*, hg. v. Heinz Bechert, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Walter, Adolf, 1923: Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunktivs im Griechischen, Heidelberg: Winter.

Watkins, Calvert, 1962: Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb, I. The Sigmatic Aorist, Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies.

——, 1969: Indogermanische Grammatik (hg. v. Jerzy Kuryłowicz), Band III: Formenlehre. Erster Teil, Geschichte der Indogermanischen Verbalflexion, Heidelberg: Winter.

——, 1971: "Hittite and Indo-European studies: the denominative statives in *-*ē*-", TPS 1971, 51-93.

Weber, Claudia, 1999: Buddhistische Beichten in Indien und bei den Uiguren, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Weiss, Michael, 1993: Studies in Italic Nominal Morphology, Ph.D. thesis Cornell University.

——, 1994: "On the Non-Verbal Origin of the Greek Verb νήφειν 'to be sober'", HS 197, 91-98.

——, 1996: Review of Andrew Sihler, New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin in: American Journal of Philology 117, 670-675.

West, Stephanie, 1967: The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer, Köln/Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag (Papyrologica Coloniensia III).

Widmer, Paul, 1998: "Tocharisch AB *klāw-*, A *klyos-*/B *klyaus-*, gav. *srāuuahiia-*", MSS 58, 171-184.

——, 2001: "Ererbtes und Geneuertes: Die Präteritumklasse VI des Tocharischen", SEC 6, 181-191.

——, 2006: "La métrique tokharienne: l'influence indienne et quelques développements tokhariens", *La langue poétique indo-européenne. Actes du Colloque de travail de la Société des Études Indo-Européennes, Paris, 22–24 octobre 2003*, éd. par Georges-Jean Pinault et Daniel Petit, Leuven/Paris: Peeters, 523-535.

Wijk, N. van, 1915: "Das litauische langvokalische Präteritum", IF 34, 1914/15, 367-383.

Wilkens, Jens, 2008: "Maitrisimit und Maitreyasamitināṭaka", *Aspects of research into Central Asian Buddhism. In memoriam Kōgi Kudara*, ed. by Peter Zieme, Turnhout: Brepols (Silk Road Studies 16), 407-433.

Windekens, Albert Joris Van, 1940: De Indo-Europeesche Bestanddeelen in de Tocharische Declinatie, Leuven: Université Catholique Louvain (Philologische Studiën, Teksten en Verhandelingen 21-22).

——, 1941: Lexique étymologique des dialectes tokhariens, Louvain: Muséon.

——, 1944: Morphologie comparée du tokharien, Louvain: Muséon.

Winter, Werner, 1955: "A linguistic classification of "Tocharian" B texts", JAOS 75, 216-225 = Winter, 1984, 91-111 = Winter, 2005, 1-10.

——, 1955a: Review of TochSprR(B) in: Lg 31, 105-109.

——, 1958: "Zur Dialektgliederung von 'Tocharisch' B", KZ 75, 233-237 = Winter, 2005, 21-25.

——, 1960: "'Tocharian' Evidence for Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals", *Evidence for Laryngeals. Work papers of a conference in Indo-European linguistics on May 7 and 8, 1959*, ed. by Werner Winter, Austin/Texas: Department of Germanic Languages, Univ. of Texas, 173-185.

——, 1961: "Zum sogenannten Durativum in Tocharisch B", KZ 77, 89-96 = Winter, 1984, 160-168 = Winter, 2005, 28-35.

——, 1961a: "Lexical Interchange between 'Tocharian' A and B", JAOS 81, 271-280 = Winter, 1984, 65-85 = Winter, 2005, 36-45.

——, 1962: "Nominal and Pronominal Dual in Tocharian", Lg 38, 111-134 = Winter, 1984, 124-159 = Winter, 2005, 69-92.

——, 1962a: "Die Vertretung indogermanischer Dentale im Tocharischen", IF 67, 16-35 = Winter, 1984, 258-277 = Winter, 2005, 46-65.

——, 1965: "Tocharian evidence [for laryngeals]", *Evidence for laryngeals*, ed. by Werner Winter, The Hague, etc.: Mouton, 190-211 = Winter, 2005, 106-127.

——, 1965a: "Zur Vorgeschichte einiger Verbformen in Tocharisch A", KZ 79, 203-210 = Winter, 1984, 169-177 = Winter, 2005, 128-135.

——, 1970: "Über tocharische Verbformen in ihrem Verhältnis zum Satzakzent", in: Marggraf, 1970, 95-103 = Winter, 2005, 141-149.

——, 1971: "Baktrische Lehnwörter im Tocharischen", *Donum Indogermanicum. Festgabe für Anton Scherer zum 70. Geburtstag*, hg. v. Robert Schmitt-Brandt, Heidelberg: Winter, 217-223 = Winter, 1984, 39-46 = Winter, 2005, 150-156.

——, 1972: "Zur Vertretung von *w* nach Konsonant in Tocharisch B", Orbis 21, 385-390 = Winter, 1984, 205-211 = Winter, 2005, 157-162.

——, 1976: Review of Stumpf, 1971 in: ZDMG 126, 179-181.

——, 1976a: "Tocharisch B *-au-* : tocharisch A *-e-*", Orbis 25, 27-33 = Winter, 2005, 163-169.

——, 1977: "Internal Structure and External Relationship of Two Verbal Paradigms: Tocharian B *weñ*-, A *weñ*- 'SAY'", JIES 5, 133-159 = Winter, 1984, 178-204 = Winter, 2005, 170-196.

——, 1980: "Morphological signaling of selection properties: transitiveness in Tocharian B and A verbs", *Historical Morphology*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, The Hague, etc.: Mouton (TLSM 17), 421-442 = Winter, 2005, 203-224.

——, 1980a: "Tocharisch B *yok*, A *yok* ‚Körperhaar; Farbe‘ und Verwandtes", *Wege zur Universalienforschung. Sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge zum 60. Geburtstag von Hansjakob Seiler*, hg. v. Gunter Brettschneider u. Christian Lehmann, Tübingen: Narr, 469-472 = Winter, 1984, 284-290 = Winter, 2005, 225-228.

——, 1980b: "Zum Beitrag der tocharischen Sprachen zu Problemen der lautlichen Rekonstruktion des Indogermanischen", *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie. Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wien, 24.–29. September 1978*, hg. v. Manfred Mayrhofer et al., Wiesbaden: Reichert, 542-563 = Winter, 1984, 232-257 = Winter, 2005, 229-250.

——, 1981: Review of VW I and VW II, 1 in: Kratylos 25, 1980[1981], 125-132.

——, 1982: "Tocharian and Proto-Indo-European", Lingua Posnaniensis 25, 1-11 = Winter, 1984, 217-231 = Winter, 2005, 251-261.

——, 1982a: Review of VW I and VW II,1 in: ZDMG 132, 399-402.

——, 1983: "*A tentative English-Walapai dictionary* und *Etymologicum Tocharicum*: Unterschiede und Gemeinsamkeiten", *Das etymologische Wörterbuch. Fragen der Konzeption und Gestaltung*, hg. v. Alfred Bammesberger, Regensburg: Pustet (Eichstätter Beiträge 8), 313-327.

——, 1984: *Studia Tocharica. Selected writings. Ausgewählte Beiträge*, Poznán: Uniwersytet Im. Adama Mickiewicza.

——, 1984a: "B*śka*, A*śkā*; B*e*; B*ecce*, A*aci*", in: Winter, 1984, 117-123 = Winter, 2005, 262-268.

——, 1984b: "B staukka-", in: Winter, 1984, 212-216 = Winter, 2005, 269-273.

——, 1985: "Tocharian B *soy*, A *se* and related forms", JAOS 105, 259-264 = Winter, 2005, 287-292.

——, 1987: "Tocharian B *ñakte*, A *ñkät* 'god': Two nouns, their derivatives, their etymology", JIES 15, 297-325 = Winter, 2005, 300-328.

——, 1988: "Cardinal points and other directions in Tocharian A and B", *Languages and Cultures. Studies in Honor of Edgar C. Polomé*, ed. by Mohammad Ali Jazayery and Werner Winter, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (TLSM 36), 775-791 = Winter, 2005, 329-345.

——, 1988a: "The loss of Tocharian B *-w- and its conditions", TIES 2, 211-220 = Winter, 2005, 346-355.

——, 1989: "The ending Tocharian B -ar (-är) of the active preterit", *Hañjamana*, ed. by Subhadra Kumar Sen, Calcutta: Calcutta University, 114-117.

——, 1990: "The importance of fine points in spelling: deletion of accented vowels in Tocharian B", *Historical Linguistics and Philology*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak: Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (TLSM 46), 371-391 = Winter, 2005, 393-413.

——, 1990a: "B -ññ- : -wññ- and related problems", TIES 4, 5-31 = Winter, 2005, 366-392.

——, 1990b: "Verbale Paradigmen des Tocharischen", *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Congress of Linguists, Berlin/GDR, August 10– August 15, 1987*, vol. 3, ed. by Werner Bahner et al., Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2534-2537 = Winter, 2005, 414-417.

——, 1991: "The mediopassive present participles in Tocharian A", TIES 5, 45-56 = Winter, 2005, 422-433.

——, 1991a: Review of Thomas, 1990 in: CAJ 35, 317-320 = Winter, 2005, 418-421.

——, 1992: "[Numerals in] Tocharian", *Indo-European Numerals*, ed. by Jadranka Gvozdanović, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (TLSM 57), 97-161.

——, 1993: "The development of underlying accented "schwa" before dental in Tocharian", TIES 6, 197-205 = Winter, 2005, 441-449.

——, 1994: "Syncope in Tocharian A", *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, unter Mitwirkung von Benedicte Nielsen hg. v. Jens Elmegård Rasmussen, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 401-415 = Winter, 2005, 450-464.

——, 1994a: "Zum tocharischen Verb", *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath, Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 4), 284-308 = Winter, 2005, 465-490.

——, 1997: "Lexical archaisms in the Tocharian languages", *Historical, Indo-European, and Lexicographical Studies. A Festschrift for Ladislav Zgusta on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, ed. by Hans Henrich Hock, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (TLSM 90), 183-193; ~ Winter, 1998 = Winter, 2005, 491-501.

——, 1998: "Lexical archaisms in the Tocharian languages", *The Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Peoples of Western Central Asia. Vol. I, Archeology Migration and Nomadism, Linguistics*, ed. by Victor H. Mair, Washington 1998: Institute for the Study of Man (JIES Monogr. 26), 347-357 ~ Winter, 1997.

——, 1999: "Tocharian marginalia", TIES 8, 247-274.

——, 2001: Review of DoT in: CAJ 45, 128-138 = Winter, 2005, 517-527.

——, 2003: Review of DoT in: JAOS 123, 202-208.

——, 2003a: "A new look at a Tocharian B text", TIES 10, 105-124 = Winter, 2005, 528-543.

——, 2005: *Kleine Schriften, Selected Writings, in zwei Bänden. Festgabe aus Anlass des 80. Geburtstags*, ausgewählt und hg. v., selected and ed. by Olav Hackstein, Bremen: Hempen.

Zaborski, Andrzej, 2007: „Non-causative Verbs of the Causative *'aqtala* Class in Arabic and **yuqtilu* Conjugation in Proto-Semitic", *Studies in Semitic and General Linguistics in Honor of Gideon Goldenberg*, ed. by Tail Bar and Eran Cohen, Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 31-43.

Zieme, Peter, 1974: "Ein uigurischer Landverkaufsvertrag aus Murtuq", AoF 1, 295-308.

Zimmer, Stefan, 1986: Review of Peter P. Anreiter, Bemerkungen zu den Reflexen indogermanischer Dentale im Tocharischen, Innsbruck 1984: Inst. f. Sprachwissenschaft (IBS 42), in: Kratylos 31, 82-89.

——, 1996: Review of *Tocharisch. Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*, hg. v. Bernfried Schlerath, Reykjavík 1994: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands (TIES Suppl. 4) in: Kratylos 41, 113-125.

INDEX VERBORUM

Proto-Indo-European

Tocharian A

Tocharian B

Anatolian

Indo-Iranian

Sanskrit

Avestan

Armenian

Greek

Latin

ācer, 523
axāre, 522
carmen, 555
cēdō, 567
cēlāre, 400[55]
clingō, 624
currō, 921
dicāre, 399
eunt-, 490[24]
ferent-, 490[24]
lēgī, 160[61], 187, 838f.
noxa, 430[2]

placēre, 740f.
polliceor, 743
pūrus, 728
putus, 728
salīre, 942
splendere, 742
subiugō, 809
trīcae, 670
tundere, 651
uēnari, 400[55]
uidē-, 159

Germanic

Go. *berum*, 187
OHG *blat*, 14[13]
OE *dēog*, 663
Go. *faurhts*, 712

OIce. *hverfa*, 601f.
Proto-Germ. *mangjan*, 753
Go. *tekan*, 646
Go. *waurstw*, 888

Balto-Slavic

Lith. *móju*, 750
OCS *pěti*, 723

Lith. *runkù*, 830
Lith. *vérdu*, 914

Index Locorum