AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ

Remarks on Inner-Tocharian Borrowing and the Etymology of Tocharian A *lek* 'shape; gesture', B *lek** 'gesture'

Giulio IMBERCIADORI[*]

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München, Germany

© 2023 Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

Check for updates

ABSTRACT

After discussing some thus far unknown examples of inner-Tocharian borrowing processes with direction TA >> TB, the present paper argues that also the substantive B *lek** 'gesture' represents a loanword from Tocharian A, in particular from the Tocharian A form *lek* 'shape; gesture'. Under the assumption of a semantic development 'equality, identity, correspondence' ⇒ 'figure, shape' ⇒ 'gesture' – for which parallels are available –, A *lek* is etymologically connected with the independently reconstructable root PIE **leig̑*-'(be[come]) equal' and thus traced back to a nominal pre-form **lóig̑-u*- or **lóig̑-o*-.

The present contribution consists in a closer investigation of the Tocharian lexemes A *lek* 'shape; gesture', B *lek** 'gesture', on whose etymology scholars have held quite divergent opinions: while some scholars have regarded both forms as directly inherited from Proto-Tocharian, others have posited an inner-Tocharian borrowing, with the Proto-Tocharian lexeme having been inherited into only one of the two languages.

---

[*] Corresponding author. E-mail: giulio.imberciadori@gmail.com

AKJournals

1. SEMANTICS & ATTESTATIONS

1.1. Tocharian A – part 1

The substantive nom./obl.sg. A *lek* – not to be confused with the adverb A *lek* 'away' – is translated as 'Aussehen, Geste' in *TG*: 48–49 (cf. 'aspectus, gestus (?)' in *TLT*: 271), 'Gebärde, Geste' in *TEB* 2, 136, and 'gesture' in JWP: 295. A *lek* is of unknown gender and is attested six times in the Tocharian A corpus, where it appears in two fixed collocations.

The first collocation is A *lek yām-* 'do the gesture / movement of',[1] as per (1).

(1) Attestations of A *lek yām-*:

i. A6a6 (*Puṇyavantajātaka*): *śewiṃträ potäk pañwtsi lek yaṣ* 'il [le peintre] bâille, il fait le geste de s'étirer tout son long' (Pinault 2022: 525).[2]

ii. YQ III.12b4 (*Maitreyasamitināṭaka*): *(krämpo)nt pältsäkyo tsru caṃ wināssi lek yāmuräṣ träṅkäṣ* 'with a (worried) mind having made [only] some weak gesture of veneration, he says …' (after JWP: 197).

The second collocation is A *lek pikār* 'gesture' / 'Miene [und] Gebärde' (thus Thomas 1972: 436–437 n. 1), a *Wortverbindung* of two (quasi) synonyms[3] which could also be used – like simple A *lek* – as direct object of A *yām-* 'do', cf. (2).

(2) Attestations of A *lek pikār*:

i. A55b4: *kₐleñci waṅke lek pikār* 'female chat [and] gesticulation' (*CEToM* [A55]).

ii. A90b5 (*Nandacarita* I): *nātkis seyo lek pik(ā)r kärsātär* 'the gesture will be understood by the son of the lord' (Peyrot 2013: 629).

iii. A191b2: /// *aptsaräntwäṣ lek pikār* /// '… from the Apsaras a gesture …'.

iv. A301b4-b5 (*Maitreyasamitināṭaka*): *tāmaṃ kanaṃ tsar peyo abhinai ypār tsepäntā-* b5 *-(ñ)* /// *(tsä)ryo lek pikār ypār* 'zu der Melodie machten die Tänzer mit Hand [und] Fuß Pantomime (…) mit (der Hand) (?) machten sie Geste [und] Gebärde' (reading and translation according to Thomas 1957: 56 with n. 4).

1.2. Tocharian A – part 2

Beside A *lek*, one finds the Tocharian A forms *lekā* (A226a3 [2x], a4 [3x]) and *lekac* (A314b3, A315 = A316a4, A323a4; ? A431b5). While *TG*: 293 and *TLT*: 271 leave A *lekā* untranslated and *TLT*: 271 connects A *lekac* ('procul') with A *lek* 'away', Couvreur (1955–1956: 69) proposes to gloss both A *lekac* and A *lekā* as 'aussehend wie'.

---

[1] This collocation – likewise corresponding B *lek yām-* (see 1.3. below) – is not dealt with by Meunier's (2013) treatment of Tocharian syntagmata built with the verb AB *yām-*.

[2] As Pinault (2022: 525 with references) has convincingly argued, Sieg's (1944: 9, 16) tentative translation of A *potäk* as 'paw, hand' should be replaced by 'tout du long, tout son long'.

[3] As to A *pikār*, it is attested – beside the loci in the main text above – five further times in contexts very similar to those of A *lek pikār*: it is object of A *yām-* 'do' and associated with A *rape* 'music' in A219b1 (cf. especially A301b4-b5) and connected with female (supernatural) beings like the Apsaras, female Vidyādharas, etc. in A312b3, A318a2-a3, and A100b6 (cf. especially A55b4 and A191b2). For the etymological discussion, see footnote 8 below.

The latter meaning fits well with at least two of the available attestations of A *lekac*, both dealing with the *Sonnenaufgangswunder* of the Buddha. There, A *lekac* functions as indeclinable adjective modifying the syntagmata A *vaiḍuriṣi āsāṃ* 'beryl throne' and A *vaiḍurṣiñi āsā(ñi)* 'beryl throne(s)', as per (3).

(3) Selected attestations of A *lekac*:

i.   A314b3: *kärtkālsaṃ sumer lekac vaiḍurṣiñi āsā(ñi) (pākär) (tākar)* 'on the ponds Sumeru-like throne(s) of beryl (became visible)' (after *CEToM* [A314]).

ii. A315 = A316a4: *tām kolmaṃ ywārśka sumer lekac vaiḍuriṣi āsāṃ pākä(r) (tāk)* 'in the middle of that pond a Sumeru-like throne of beryl (became) visible' (cf. Huard 2022: 410, 411)[4] – differently *DTA*: 207 and *CEToM* (A315 = A316), where A *sumer lekac* is translated as 'in the direction toward the Sumeru'.

Less clear is the fragmentary attestation in A323a4: *lekac k$_u$yal nu lymāṣ* /// (beginning of the line). As to A431b5 (*päklyoṣ śomiṃ pes leka – – – r prak·· ///* [end of the line]), it is unclear whether it belongs here at all.

The supposed meaning 'similar to' of A *lekac* is nicely confirmed by the attestations of A *lekā*, which is only found in the manuscript A226 (*Maitreyāvadānavyākaraṇa*).[5] In the lines a3-a4, A *lekā* occurs in the description of infernal beings, whose bodies are compared to objects of the most disparate shapes. As noted by Chamot-Rooke (2022: 58, 59 with n. 117), A *lekā* corresponds to the Old Uyghur preposition *osuglug* 'similar to' (← substantive *osug* 'way, manner' [Wilkens 2021: 516]) and is constantly complemented by preceding genitival adjectives in *-ṣi*. Accordingly, the attested syntagmata A *X-ṣi lekā* should be translated as 'with the shape of X, similar to X', as per (4).

(4) Selected attestations of A *lekā*:

i.   A226a3: *k(apśäñño neñc) wampeṣi (ñemintwāṣi) l(e)kā cem : mahurṣi lekā ṣome* 'those (have) b(odies) in the shape of ornaments, (of jewels), some in the shape of a diadem' (reading and translation according to Chamot-Rooke 2022: 34, 38, 40).

ii. A226a3-a4: (– – – – –) a4 *mokśi kṣuraṣi lek=ālyek saṃ* 'some others [have bodies] in the shape (of ...), of a knife, of a razor' (reading and translation according to Chamot-Rooke 2022: 34, 38, 40).

In view of the above, A *lekac* and A *lekā* should be segmented as A *lek-ac* and A *lek-ā* respectively and be analyzed as the allative and perlative case forms of an underlying substantive A *lek** 'figure, shape'. A *lek-ā* is a perlative with instrumental function (cf. *TEB* 1, 85; Carling 2000: 14), as witnessed by the fixed collocations with the structure *X-ṣi lek-ā* 'with the shape of X, similar to X' (cf. (4) above). A *lek-ac* is formally an allative: however, this secondary case form turns out to be more deeply lexicalized than the perlative A *lek-ā*, since it exhibits a plain adjectival semantics 'similar to', without any synchronic reference to the meaning 'figure, shape' of the underlying substantive *lek**.[6] In addition, A *lekac* does not govern genitival adjectives in *-ṣi*, but is complemented by substantives in the bare nom./obl.-stem – cf. the syntagma A *sumer lekac* 'Sumeru-like, similar to Sumeru' in (3) above. Structurally, one might compare the postposition A *pos-ac* 'beside'

---

[4] For the translation of A *koläm* – traditionally glossed as 'ship, boat' (e.g. *TEB* 2, 97; *DTA*: 207) – as 'bassin, pond', see Huard (2022: 410–413, 576).
[5] This manuscript has been recently studied in detail by Chamot-Rooke (2022).
[6] The original semantics of the frozen allative A *lek-ac* should be reconstructed as *'toward the figure / shape of, (coming) close to the figure / shape of' ⇒ 'similar to'.

(governing oblique or genitive [*TG*: 290; Carling 2000: 329]), which also goes back to a lexicalized allative – cf., next to A *pos-ac*, the frozen locative A *pos-aṃ* 'beside, below'.[7]

It follows from the above discussion that for the substantive A *lek* two synchronic meanings should be assumed, namely 'gesture' and 'figure, shape' – cf. Sieg, Siegling and Schulze's translation (*TG*: 48–49) 'Aussehen, Geste'. Remarkably, though, the latter semantics 'figure, shape' is restricted to (more or less lexicalized) secondary case forms. The relation between the meanings 'figure, shape' (cf. A *lek-ā*, *lek-ac*) and 'gesture' (cf. A *lek*) will be further discussed in section 3.3. below.

1.3. Tocharian B

The substantive B *lek** is translated as 'Gebärde, Geste' in *TEB* 2, 236 and 'movement, gesture' in *DTB*²: 607. It is attested twice in syntactic contexts nearly identical to those of A *lek*.

On the one hand, B *lek yām-* 'do the gesture / movement of' occurs in the late Sängim text B108b5 (Conversion of the Kāśyapa brothers): *iryāpathänta śwāra yāmṣate lyama śama mas=orkäntai lek yamaṣṣa lyśalyñeṣṣe* 'il [*scil.* Buddha] réalisa les quatre types de mouvements: il s'assit, il se leva, il alla de-ci de-là, il fit le geste de s'allonger' (Pinault 2008: 168); cf. the syntagma A *lek yām-* treated in (1) above.

On the other hand, in the late Sängim text B109b8 (Yaśodharā) the plural B *lekanma* 'gestures' is paired with the synonymous plural B *pikāränta*[8] and functions as object of an incomplete form of the verb B *yām-* 'do': *lekanma pikāränta ya – –* (end of the line); cf. the collocation A *lek pikār* (*yām-*) dealt with in (2) above.

The plural ending *-(a)nma* of B *lekanma*, belonging to the nominal class II.2 according to the classification by Krause and Thomas (*TEB* 1, 121–122), betrays genus alternans: cf. *TEB* 1, 122, 2, 236; Hartmann (2013: 349); Pinault (2015: 181–182); the masculine given in *DTB*²: 608 is incorrect. Although no nominative singular form is attested, appurtenance to the nominal class II.2 secures the reconstruction of a nominative singular B *lek** (= oblique singular).

Note, finally, that no trace of a semantics 'figure, shape' beside 'gesture' (see 1.2. above) is recoverable for B *lek**.

---

[8] As to B *pikār**, it is attested – beside B109b8 (see the main text above) – four further times, namely as perlative singular B *pikār-sa* in B606a3Š and as second member of the pair B *yakne pikār** 'manner / habit [and] gesture' in PKAS17Ia3, b3-b4 (DA) and IOL Toch 205b4 (where an obl.pl. B *(ya)kneṃ* should be restored at the beginning of the line). Etymologically, B *pik-ār** s.g.m. 'gesture' and its equivalent A *pik-ār* alt. 'id.' (see footnote 3 above) are probably related to the verbal root AB *pik*ⁱ- 'paint, write' (*DTB*²: 410 with references) and must have thus meant originally *'writing, writing sign' ⇒ *'sign' ⇒ 'gesture' (the attractive assumption of an intermediate semantics *'sign' was pointed out to me by an anonymous reviewer). As for the involved derivational suffix, one might compare the morpheme A *-ār* of the deverbal type A *oks-ar* (< *oks-ār*) 'plant', A *tsm-ār* 'root', etc. Note that the obl. sg. B *pik-ār** – presupposed by the perl.sg. B *pikār-sa* – points to an underlyingly trisyllabic structure B /pik-árä/*.

2. INNER-TOCHARIAN RELATIONS

Since the vowel correspondence B *e* : A *e* – apart from the particular case of PToch. **æ* before nasal-plus-sibilant clusters or palatalized nasals (Hilmarsson 1987: 71–72) – cannot be *lautgesetzlich*, it is likely that one of the two Tocharian languages borrowed the word for 'shape; gesture' from the other or that both of them borrowed this word from a third language.

2.1. Hypothesis 1: Borrowing from a third language

Under the hypothesis of a foreign origin, the only possible source of A *lek*, B *lek** I was able to identify is the Sanskrit form *lekhā-* f.: its basic semantics is 'scratch, line, stroke, furrow', but among the secondary meanings also a semantics 'drawing, likeness, figure' is attested according to MW: 901.2. Nevertheless, this hypothesis is rather unlikely, since it remains unclear why the Tocharian languages should have borrowed Skt. *lekhā-* in its secondary semantics 'figure'.

2.2. Hypothesis 2: Borrowing from Tocharian B to Tocharian A

Assuming that one of the two Tocharian languages borrowed the word for 'shape; gesture' from the other, the unmarked hypothesis for explaining the relation between A *lek* and B *lek** would be a borrowing process with direction B >> A, thus deeming B *lek** to be the inherited form. Nevertheless, such a scenario encounters several difficulties.

If one reconstructs an old *men*-stem – on the basis of the attested plural B *lekanma* –, the singular allomorph B *lek** remains unexplained, since it would be expected to show some trace of the old suffix **-mn̥*: cf. B sg. *wāk-i* (: A *wākä-m*) ~ pl. B *waka-nma* 'difference'.[9] Therefore, the plural suffix B *-(a)nma* should be regarded as secondary.

Alternatively, on the basis of the singular B *lek**, the following further analyses would be conceivable. (i) B *lek** continues a neuter *u*-stem: in this case, however, traces of *u*-inflection would be expected to show up both in the singular (i.e., B **lekw* like B *taṅkw* 'love') and in the plural (cf. Pre-PToch. **u̯āstu-* > B sg. *ost* ~ pl. *ost-wa* 'house'). (ii) B *lek** continues a neuter *n*-stem: however, one should reconstruct a root morpheme with *o*-grade (cf. B *-e-*), which would be hard to motivate morphologically, all the more so since primary neuter *n*-stems are usually not reconstructed as an inflectional category for Proto-Indo-European (PIE) (Melchert 2010). (iii) The only viable analysis would be parsing B *lek** as continuant of a neuter *i*-stem, although in this case no suitable root of the necessary shape PIE **(H/u̯)leK-* presents itself (see also section 3. below).

Finally, an additional argument speaks against the assumption of a borrowing process with direction B >> A: if A *lek* really represents a loanword from Tocharian B, why is this item much more frequent in Tocharian A (6x without counting A *lekā* / *lekac*) than in Tocharian B (2x)?

---

[9] On the evolution of the PIE suffix **-mn̥* in Tocharian, see, among others, Malzahn 2005: 396–398 and Pinault 2008: 495; 2020: 485.

In consideration of the appreciably larger size of the Tocharian B corpus – 'approximately 9,000 fragments preserved, as against 2,000 for Tocharian A' according to Peyrot (2015: 131)[10] – such a difference in proportions might not be due to chance.

2.3. Hypothesis 3: Borrowing from Tocharian A to Tocharian B

Although some past scholars – eminently A. J. Van Windekens – constantly admitted borrowings from Tocharian A to Tocharian B, this is no longer *communis opinio* today (Winter 1961: 83–85; 1962; Lane 1966, esp. 119–120, 126, 129; Kim 2019: 182 n. 17). However, some particular cases, which for space reasons can be treated only briefly here, are not so easy to dismiss.[11]

2.3.1. The prefixed adjective B *oṅkipṣe* 'shameless' is regarded as a loanword from Tocharian A by Hilmarsson (1989: 102; 1991: 154–155), since the lexeme for 'shame' is *kwipe* in Tocharian B (cf. B *kwipassu* 'modest'), but *kip* in Tocharian A. In addition, the rounding *#a- > #o- before following *-ṅkw- is a phonological process proper to Tocharian A, as in A *oṅk* : B *eṅkwe* 'man' (Hilmarsson 1989: 102–111). For B *oṅkipṣe* one should thus assume that speakers of Tocharian B introduced the customary suffixal vowel -*e* in place of the -*i* they borrowed from the well-formed item Pre-Toch. A *oṅ-kip-ṣi*. This reshaping made possible to regularly inflect the adjective in question in Tocharian B: indeed, B *oṅkipṣe* follows the productive pattern of the adjectives in B -*ṣ(ṣ)e*, as shown by the vocative singular B *oṅkipṣu* (e.g. B89b1Š classic). Moreover, since '[b]efore a consonant the nasal [of the negative prefix] is lost in East Tocharian without regard to preceding or following sounds' (Hilmarsson 1991: 193), one ought to assume that Pre-Toch. A *oṅ-kipṣi* was borrowed quite early in Tocharian B. This assumption is confirmed by the fact that B *oṅkipṣe* occurs already in archaic Tocharian B texts, e.g. THT1859a2 (see Huard 2020: 16, 21).[12]

2.3.2. The exact semantics of the adjective / adverb A *lyāk* is disputed. Whereas *TEB* 2, 137, 237 reckons with 'bright, visible' and Carling (2021: 85–86) with 'well-shaped', Pinault (2006: 77–78 with n. 27) proposes 'flat': the latter translation seems more likely, since it is based on the correspondence between A *lyāk ṣiraś* and Old Uyghur *tüp tüz* 'vollkommen gleichmäßig' (Wilkens 2021: 773–774) in A212b6 + YQ II.4b4-b5 (cf. also Huard 2022: 40 n. 61). The equivalent form B *lyāk* occurs in contexts similar to those of A *lyāk*, e.g. as an attribute to the word for 'chest' in B74a4 (cf. A378a5): therefore, a semantics 'flat' should be assumed for B *lyāk* as well (*DTB*[2]: 615).

If both B *lyāk* and A *lyāk* are regarded as inherited, they could only continue an old *i*-stem, because a Pre-Proto-Tocharian *o*-stem would have yielded B **lyāke*, while an *u*-stem would have produced B **lyākw* (cf. B *taṅkw* 'love'). However, the following arguments rather point to a borrowing process with direction A >> B: (i) A *lyāk* (10x) is much better attested than B *lyāk* (2x [B73a6Š, B74a4Š]), the latter only occurring in classical texts; (ii) A *lyāk* is at least partially declinable (cf. nom.sg.f. *lyāki* modifying A *ytār* f. 'way' in A147a2), whereas B *lyāk* is not – cf. B73a6 *wartsa wlaś(k)a l(y)āk pratsā(k)o* 'bright, soft [and] flat chest'; (iii) if it does not exhibit the resegmented suffix A -*atsune*, the abstract A *lyāka-tsune* (A397b2, b3) presupposes a base A **lyāka* (> *lyāk*), whose expected Tocharian B counterpart ought to be **lyāke* rather than *lyāk*, as per above.

---

[10] Cf. also Malzahn 2017: 157.

[11] For a detailed treatment of the Tocharian forms under 2.3.1.–2.3.4. below, see Imberciadori 2023.

[12] In contrast, *DTB*[2]: 117–118 regards *oṅkipṣe* as a genuine Tocharian B formation, but his assumption that in B '**eṅ-kwíp-äṣṣe* […] the rounding of -*kw*- was reassigned to the preceding vowel, giving the attested *oṅkipṣe*', is ad hoc.

2.3.3. The next case in point is the indeclinable adjective / adverb B *akäṃñc*, a hapax[13] attested in IOL Toch 39a3 (archaic; *Udānavarga*).[14] The spelling as *akäṃñc* rather than **akäṃñcä* or **akäṃñco* in an archaic text suggests that the item at hand was underlyingly disyllabic in Tocharian B, i.e. B /ákäñc/ = **ākäñc*. Besides, one finds the indeclinable adjective / adverb A *ākiñc*, hapax in A353b4. Both Tocharian forms occur as translations of Bud.-Skt. *prāntaṃ* 'distant(ly), remote(ly)' (*BHSD*: 392.2), cf. Schmidt (1989: 105) and *DTA*: 35.

Although both B **ākäñc* and A *ākiñc* are clearly related to the substantives B *āke*, A *āk* 'end', only A *āk-iñc* can be deemed morphologically well-formed, since an adjectival morpheme *-iñc* is only known for Tocharian A – cf. A *ṣul-iñc* 'north' ⇐ **'northern'* ⇐ **'belonging to the mountains'* ⇐ A *ṣul* 'mountain'. In contrast, B **ākäñc* is synchronically unmotivated,[15] and it is thus best analyzed as a loanword from Tocharian A. The vocalic mismatch A *-i-* : B /-ä-/ (cf. A *ākiñc* : B **ākäñc*) can be explained through the assumption that Tocharian B borrowed a non-palatalized variant A **āk-äñc*, likely to have existed beside A *āk-iñc* – cf. A *ciñcär ~ cäñcär* 'lovely'.

2.3.4. The secondary adjectives B *onmi-ṣṣe* ~ onmiṃ-ṣṣe*, A *onmi-ṣi** 'pertaining to remorse' as well as B *onmi-ssu** 'remorseful' occur synchronically beside the substantive AB *onmiṃ* 'remorse'. Based on B *onmiṃ-ṣṣe*, one might at first explain the coexisting variant B *onmi-ṣṣe** as well the Tocharian A form A *onmi-ṣi** admitting a loss of the stem final nasal before the following suffixal sibilant. However, this hypothesis is unattractive: (i) one would expect forms with and without stem final nasal to coexist also in the case of B *onmi-ssu** 'remorseful' (4x), but for the latter adjective no forms in °*ṃ-s°* are attested;[16] (ii) in Tocharian A, a simplification **°ṃ-ṣ° > °-ṣ°* would find several counterexamples – cf. A *puttiśparäṃ-ṣi* 'pertaining to the dignity of a Buddha' (A17a5 *et al.*), A *napeṃ-ṣi* 'pertaining to a man' (A60a5 *et al.*), etc. Thus, the joined witness of the adjectives B *onmi-ṣṣe**, A *onmi-ṣi** 'pertaining to remorse' and B *onmi-ssu** 'remorseful' points to the existence of an unattested substantive base with obl.sg. AB **onmi* 'remorse', which can be regarded as inherited in both Tocharian languages.[17]

As for the attested substantive AB *onmiṃ* 'remorse', the following observation is crucial here: whereas its morphological structure is unanalyzable within Tocharian B, it is regularly explicable within Tocharian A. In the latter language, A *onmi-ṃ* can easily be interpreted as a substantivized adjective in A *-ṃ* derived from the original substantive A **onmi* (see above): i.e., A **onmi* 'remorse' → *onmi-ṃ* (**'pertaining to remorse'* ⇒) 'remorse'. From Tocharian A, one might adduce structural parallels like A *poke-ṃ** (**'pertaining to the arm'* ⇒) 'bracelet' or A *plyaske-ṃ* (**'pertaining to meditation'* ⇒) 'meditation', the latter being – like A *onmiṃ* – an important notion of

---

[13] The other putative attestation of the form under discussion in PKNS36 = PKNS20b2-b3DA (classic) = B93b5Š (classic-late) – namely *(a)kañc* – is highly uncertain and will therefore be left aside in the following. For two divergent views about B *(a)kañc*, see Pinault 2009: 227 and Peyrot 2013: 340 n. 390.

[14] Against the interpretation of B *akäṃñc* in IOL Toch 39a3 as a nominative dual, see Kim 2018: 55 n. 142 *contra* *DTB*²: 1.

[15] Unlikely is Hilmarsson's (1996: 6) proposal to regard B **ākäñc* as the adverbialized oblique singular of an unattested substantive B **ak-añce* (class V.2) ⇐ B *āke* 'end': the assumption of a derivational morpheme B */-äñce/* is ad hoc, since substantives of class V.2 are otherwise synchronically primary (*TEB* 1, 131–132).

[16] Note further the coexistence of forms with and without stem final nasal in the case of B *yällom-ṣṣe** 'pertaining to the sense functions' (B213a1MQ archaic-classic, PKAS6Ia6DA classic) ~ B *yällo-ṣṣe** 'id.' (PKAS5Ba4 classic) ⇐ obl.pl. B *yällom* 'sense functions' (~ nom.pl. B *yälloñ*).

[17] Specifically, one might assume the paradigms B sg. nom. **onm-iye* / obl. **onm-i* and A sg. nom./obl. **onm-i*, respectively (class VI.1a according to *TEB* 1, 132). They ultimately presuppose a pre-form Pre-PToch. **Hón(H/d)-mu-* or **(h₁)ńd-mu-*, which could belong either to a PIE root **ned-* 'pierce' or to a PIE root **h₂end⁽ʰ⁾-* 'burn'. For a detailed discussion, see Imberciadori 2023: 715–718.

Buddhism. Also in typological perspective the substantivization of secondary adjectives, which often end up replacing their derivational bases (lexical renewal), is by no means isolated – cf., e.g., OAlb. *ār 'bear' → Alb. *ar-í* (*'pertaining to a bear' ⇒) 'bear', replacing the expected form Alb. *ar.[18] Therefore, it is likely that B *onmiṃ* 'remorse' represents a loanword from A *onmi-ṃ* 'id.'. After the completion of the borrowing process, a secondary adjectival variant B *onmiṃ-ṣṣe* (influenced by B *onmiṃ*) was created within Tocharian B beside the original variant B *onmi-ṣṣe** 'pertaining to remorse'.[19]

2.3.5. Finally, a further example of inner-Tocharian lexical borrowing with direction A >> B has been most recently identified by Pan (2022: 96). In order to account for the substantive B *mastarkal 'crystal' – presupposed by the secondary adjective B *mastarkal-ṣe** 'pertaining to crystal' (nom./obl.pl.f. in THT1107b2 classic [*Karmavācanā*]) –, Pan assumes borrowing from Middle Indic (esp. Pāli) *masāragalla-*, which indicates one of the so-called seven pearls (Skt. *sapta-ratna-*; cf. *EWAia* 3, 394). In particular, Pan proposes the following development: Pāli *masāragalla-* >> A *masārakal > (vowel weakening) *masrakal > (*t*-epenthesis) *mastrakal > *mastärkal >> B *mastarkal (→ B *mastarkal-ṣe**).[20]

2.4. Interim conclusion

On the basis of the preceding observations, I propose that also B *lek** 'gesture' represents a loanword from Tocharian A.[21] Further support to this claim comes from the fact that both manuscripts where B *lek** is attested (B108 and B109) are not only late, but were also found in Sängim (Turfan region), i.e., in the easternmost part of the Tocharian speaking area. On the methodological reliability of such an argument for detecting inner-Tocharian borrowing processes, cf. *mutatis mutandis* Pinault (2017: 157): 'this idea [of regarding B *ekannī* 'possession' as a loanword from Tocharian A] remains quite arbitrary, since the occurrences of B *ekañi* are not restricted to manuscripts from the eastern region, where the influence of Tocharian A would be acceptable'.

If the hypothesis of an inner-Tocharian borrowing with direction A >> B is correct, the plural B *lek-anma* must represent an inner-Tocharian-B creation.[22] This would be unproblematic, since the plural suffix -(*a*)*nma* had become very productive in Tocharian B and could spread even beyond its original morphological environment, i.e., old *men*-stems: cf., e.g., B sg. *śaul* 'life' ~ pl. *śaul-anma*. Eventually, the plural morpheme B -(*a*)*nma* could also apply to loanwords, as in B sg. *ślok* 'strophe' ~ pl. *ślok-anma* (<< Skt. *śloka-*); cf. *TEB* 1, 122; Pinault 1989: 92; 2008: 496; Hilmarsson 1991: 172.

---

[18] See Neri in *DPEWA* s.v. *arí*.

[19] As remarked by an anonymous reviewer, it remains unclear why Tocharian B substituted the inherited form B *onmiye / *onmi (→ B *onmi-ṣṣe* and B *onmi-ssu*) with the borrowed one B *onmiṃ*. This is an interesting observation, for which at present I cannot provide a fully satisfactory explanation.

[20] B *mastarkal 'crystal' is of unknown origin according to *DTB*[2]: 477.

[21] Cf. also Van Windekens (1976: 260) and *DTB*[2]: 607, who do not comment any further on this point.

[22] For a comparable example of renewed plural after inner-Tocharian borrowing – although in the opposite direction B >> A –, see Pinault's (2015: 192–193) discussion of plural masculine B *yetwi* beside plural alternant A *yetweyu* / *yetweyntu* 'jewels'.

3. ETYMOLOGICAL DISCUSSION

3.1. Previous proposals

As far as the etymology of A *lek* 'shape; gesture', B *lek** 'gesture' is concerned, the following proposals have thus far been advanced.

3.1.1. *TLT*: 271 and *IEW*: 1178 connect A *lek*, B *lek** with Ved. *ulkā́-* f. 'fiery appearance, meteor, fire' (RV) and *ulkuṣī́-* f. 'meteor', which are traced back to a PIE root reconstructed there as **u̯ek-*. According to this scenario, the Tocharian B form should be regarded as primary.

However, the etymological relation of Ved. *ulkā́-* with Ved. *várcas-* n. 'shine, appearance' (cf. *EWAia* 1, 231–232, 2, 516; Schaffner 2020: 172–173 n. 60) rather suggests that the root in question should be reconstructed as **u̯elk-* 'burn, shine' (with full-grade I), from which no derivative with initial AB *l-* could be derived in *lautgesetzlich* fashion.

3.1.2. With the implicit assumption of a borrowing process with direction A >> B, Pisani (1942–1943: 246)[23] connects A *lek* with OIr. *lecca* (also *lecco, leccu*) 'jaw, cheek' (? < **lik-n-*), OCS *lice* n. 'face, person, appearance', Ru. *lik, likó* n. 'id.', SCr. *lîk, líce* n. 'face, cheek', etc. (< **lei̯k-(i̯)ó-*), and OPr. *laygnan* n. 'cheek' (< **loi̯k-no-*). These forms point to a root PIE **lei̯k-*.[24] By operating with a semantic shift 'face' ⇒ 'aspect, appearance, form' – which could further develop to 'gesture' (see 3.3. below) –, such a connection might be viable.

However, the present word family remains largely obscure, since the original meaning of the underlying root PIE **lei̯k-* is no longer recoverable. If any connection with A *lek*, B *lek** is accepted, it would not lead beyond a vague root etymology. In addition, the morphological analysis of the putative cognates from Celtic and Slavic remains unclear (see the references in n. 24).

3.1.3. Therefore, I will instead explore the potential of an alternative etymology of A *lek*, B *lek**, connecting the Tocharian lexemes with the Germanic and Baltic items Goth. *leik* n. 'body' and Lith. *lygùs* (~ *lýgus*; accent pattern 3 [or 1]) 'equal' – thus *in nuce* Lane 1938: 14; cf. also Van Windekens 1976: 260 and, cautiously, *DTB²*: 607 (with pre-form '**loigo-*').

Based on the discussion in *EWAhd* (5, 1264–1265 with references), I trace Goth. *leik* n. 'body' and Lith. *lygùs* 'equal' back to an underlying root PIE **lei̯g-* '(be[come]) equal',[25] as per (5).

---

[23] Cf. also Van Windekens (1976: 260) and *DTB²*: 607, without further comments.

[24] Cf. Pedersen 1909: 159; 1913: 110; Trautmann 1910: 367; *REW* 2, 41; de Bernardo Stempel 1999: 118 with n. 138; *EDSIL*: 278. Stüber (1998: 44, 116–117) reckons with non-Indo-European origin. The Celtic forms at hand are not treated by Matasović (*EDPC*).

[25] From a semantic point of view, the present root PIE **lei̯g-* '(be[come]) equal' might be viewed as related to the apparently independent root PIE **slei̯ǵ-* 'spread sth., smooth out' → OCS *slīzǔ-kǔ* 'slippery' etc. (*LIV²*: 566–567), since a core semantics 'smooth' could explain both meanings 'equal' (cf. PDE *even* 'smooth' ~ 'equal') and 'slippery'. Following de Lamberterie (1990: 516–519), one may add to this cluster also Gr. λιγύς 'clear (of sounds)' and assume a semantic shift 'smooth' ⇒ 'bright, clear' (cf. OHG *glat* 'smooth, slippery' ~ 'bright') ⇒ (specialization) 'clear (of sounds)' (cf. PDE *clear*). The absence of Winter's lengthening in OCS *slīzǔ-kǔ* 'slippery' would require the reconstruction of a barytone pre-form, since according to Neri (2017: 212–214) Winter's Law applied in open unstressed or closed syllables but not in open stressed syllables. For an overview of the above mentioned forms, see also Imberciadori 2022: 84–86. Nevertheless, the etymological connection between PIE **lei̯g-* and **slei̯ǵ-* remains uncertain, since the Balto-Slavic data could be accounted for only under the assumption of 'incomplete Balto-Slavic satemization' (cf. Fortson 2010: 415–416). I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on the content of this footnote.

(5) Derivatives of the PIE root *leig̑- '(be[come]) equal':

i.   Thematic adjective *leig̑-ó- 'equal' > adjective PGerm. *leik-a- 'equal' (> ON *líkr* 'id.', OE *līc* 'id.') → substantive PGerm. *leik-a- n. 'body' (> Goth. *leik* n. 'id.', ON *lík* n. 'id.', etc.) – more on the semantics of the latter forms in 3.3. below.[26]

ii.   Proterokinetic (PK) *u*-stem adjective PIE *léig̑-u- / *lig̑-éu̯- 'equal' >> *lig̑-ú- > (Winter's Law) PBalt. *lī̃g̑-ú- > Lith. *lygùs* (accent pattern 3)[27] 'equal'.[28]

The etymological connection between A *lek* 'shape; gesture' (>> B *lek* 'gesture') and the PIE root *leig̑- '(be[come]) equal' – so far limited to a *Wurzeletymologie* – will be further investigated in the remainder of this paper.

3.2. Developing the *leig̑- connection

On formal grounds, A *lek* can be traced back to five possible pre-forms, namely Pre-PToch. *loig̑-o- (cf. *DTB*[2]: 607), *loig̑-u-, *loig̑-i-, *loig̑-n̥- or *loig̑-. Both reconstructions *loig̑-i- and *loig̑-n̥- can be immediately dismissed, since neither *i*- nor *n*-suffixation is well represented among the derivatives of the PIE root *leig̑-. As for *loig̑-, it should be interpreted as the strong stem of an acrostatic (AS) root noun *lóig̑- / *léig̑-. However, since AS root nouns with ó/é-ablaut usually exhibit agentive or resultative meaning (cf. Schindler 1972: 36), one would not expect the present root PIE *leig̑- '(be[come]) equal' to have built such a root noun on semantic grounds. Instead, one would expect a mobile root noun *léig̑- / *lig̑-´, with abstract meaning 'equality' according to Schindler (1972: 38): the latter, though, could not explain the *e*-vocalism of A *lek*. The choice between the pre-forms Pre-PToch. *loig̑-o- and *loig̑-u- is more complex.

    3.2.1. If one accepts Pre-PToch. *loig̑-u-, an acrostatic (AS) *u*-stem abstract *lóig̑-u- / *léig̑-u- should be reconstructed. Its strong stem *lóig̑-u- would lead regularly to *loik̑ʷu > PToch. *læyk̑ʷu > (*u*-umlaut) *loyk̑ʷä > A *loykw > *lekw > lek – cf., for final -k, A *tuṅk* : B *taṅkw* 'love'. The expected Tocharian B equivalent would be an unattested form *loykw. Furthermore, if A *lek* really descends from a Pre-Proto-Tocharian *u*-stem, one would expect its unattested plural to have been A *lek-u < *lek-wā, as in the case of A pl. *waṣt-u* (: B *ost-wa*) ~ sg. *waṣt* alt. 'house'. Incidentally, the existence of a plural A *lek-u would be by no means problematic with respect to the attested plural B *lek-anma*, since – as per 2.4. above – *lek-anma* represents an inner-Tocharian-B creation.

    If A *lek* points to the reconstruction of an AS *u*-stem abstract *lóig̑-u- / *léig̑-u-, the latter might be put in straightforward derivational relation with the PK *u*-stem adjective *léig̑-u- / *lig̑-éu̯- 'equal' > Lith. *lygùs* (3) 'id.' (see 5.ii. above). Since the derivation of PK adjectives from AS abstracts is a well-known morphological process,[29] the PK *u*-stem adjective *léig̑-u- / *lig̑-éu̯- likely

---

[26] For the Germanic items, see de Vries 1977: 356; *EDPG*: 336–337; *EWAhd* 5, 1263–1265.

[27] For Lith. *lygùs* and its Baltic cognates, see *LEW* 1, 370–371; *ALEW*: 675–677; *EWAhd* 5, 1265. Since the root vocalism as well as the intonation of Lith. *lygùs* (accent pattern 3) can be straightforwardly explained as the result of Winter's Law – regularly applying in the open unstressed root syllable of the pre-form *lig̑-ú- (cf. footnote 25 above and Neri 2017: 212–214) –, the alternative reconstruction of a PIE root *leig̑H- (instead of *leig̑-) hinted at in *EWAhd* (5, 1264–1265) is unnecessary.

[28] To be sure, Lith. *lygùs* might also continue a thematic adjective Pre-PBalt. *lig̑-ó- (type *luk-ó- 'bright, clear' → ON *log* n. 'light, flame'), because the inflectional class change *-o- >> *-u- is not uncommon among adjectives in Baltic (cf. Heidermanns 1993: 382–383; Casaretto 2004: 84). However, since a pre-form *lig̑-ó- lacks outer-Baltic comparanda, I regard the *u*-stem inflection of Lith. *lygùs* as inherited.

[29] Cf., among others, Rau 2009: 173 n. 132 (with references) and Kim 2019: 183–184.

represents an internal derivative of the AS *u*-stem abstract **lóig̑-u-* / **léig̑-u-*. The latter form, in turn, might be analyzed as the *u*-substantivization[30] of an underlying thematic adjective, according to the derivational chain in (6).

(6) Tracing A (>> B) *lek* back to an *u*-stem:

Adjective **leig̑-ó-* 'equal' > PGerm. **leik-a-* 'equal' > ON *líkr* 'id.', OE *līc* 'id.';

→ AS abstract **lóig̑-u-* / **léig̑-u-* 'equality' > A *lek* 'shape; gesture' >> B *lek** 'gesture';

→ PK adjective **léig̑-u-* / **lig̑-éu̯-* 'equal' > Lith. *lygùs* (3) 'equal'.

On the inner-Tocharian semantic development see 3.3. below.

3.2.2. The alternative pre-form of a A *lek* – namely PToch. **lǣykæ* < Pre-PToch. **loig̑-o-* (see 3.2. above) – might be more precisely reconstructed as **lóig̑-o-*, which would have yielded *laike in Tocharian B. Morphologically, a substantive **lóig̑-o-* would pattern well with the adjective **leig̑-ó-* 'equal' presupposed by PGerm. **leik-a-* 'equal' (> ON *líkr* 'id.', OE *līc* 'id.', etc.). In particular, one might parse PIE **lóig̑-o-* as a substantivization of the adjective **leig̑-ó-*, derived through accent retraction and insertion of the *o*-grade[31] in the root morpheme.[32]

Note that the existence of a (frozen) allative A *lekac* does not tip the scale in favor of a thematic pre-form Pre-PToch. **lóig̑-o-* rather than **lóig̑-u-* (/ **léig̑-u-*), since the allative ending A *-ac* – although originally proper to thematic paradigms – is applied to every kind of base in Tocharian A (cf. *TEB* 1, 87; Pinault 2008: 469–470).

3.3. Semantic discussion

Since both of them represent abstract derivatives of an underlying adjective **leig̑-ó-* 'equal', it is likely that both Pre-PToch. **lóig̑-u-* (/ **léig̑-u-*) (see 3.2.1. above) and **lóig̑-o-* (see 3.2.2. above) exhibited an original meaning 'equality, identity, correspondence'.

In order to understand how such an original meaning could have generated the Tocharian semantics 'shape; gesture', one should first look at Germanic, where the etymologically related adjective PGerm. **leik-a-* 'equal' (< Pre-PGerm. **leig̑-ó-*) has been substantivized as **leik-a-* n. Although continuants of the latter form only exhibit a semantics 'body (alive or dead)' (cf. Goth. *leik* n., ON *lík* n., etc.), PGerm. **leik-a-* n. must have originally meant 'equality, identity, correspondence', whence 'what is equal, identical (to a person)' ⇒ 'image, figure, shape' ⇒ (specialization) 'body (shape)' (cf. Buck 1949: 199; Casaretto 2004: 84; *EWAhd* 5, 1265). This scenario is supported by the fact that the derivation of words for 'figure, image, (body) shape' from adjectives meaning 'equal' is well attested: cf. Gr. εἶδος n. 'image, figure' ← ἴσος 'equal' (Schaffner 2020: 173 n. 60), Lith. *lygmuõ* 'portrait' ← *lygùs* 'equal' (*ALEW*: 676), and Slov. *podoba* 'picture, appearance' ~ Pol. *podoba* 'similarity' (Buck 1949: 875).[33]

---

[30] Cf. Nussbaum 1998: 527–528; Neri 2003: 346; Höfler 2017: 150–157.

[31] On the *o*-grade substantivization process see, among others, Nussbaum 1997: 194; Neri 2013: 198; Höfler 2017: 133–144.

[32] For the assumed derivational model adjective R(*e*)-*ó*- → substantive R(*ó*)-*o*- see, among others, Neri 2013: 198; 2018: 150 n. 1 and Hackstein 2019: 111. For a different analysis cf. Nussbaum 2017, esp. 252 and passim, according to whom substantives of the type R(*ó*)-*o*- are primary – i.e., directly derived from the underlying root – and function as derivational bases for adjectives of the types R(*o*)-*ó*- and/or R(*e*)-*ó*-.

[33] For other possible sources of the meaning 'figure, image, (body) shape', see Buck 198–199 s.v. *body*; 874–875 s.v. *shape*.

If one is willing to reckon with the same development 'equality, identity, correspondence' ⇒ 'image, figure, shape' for (Pre-)Proto-Tocharian as well, (s)he only needs the further assumption that such a semantics 'figure, shape' was not specialized to 'body (shape)' as in Germanic, but rather developed to 'gesture'. Notably, both involved meanings 'figure, shape' and 'gesture' are attested for A *lek*, whereas B *lek** only exhibits the semantics 'gesture'.

For the proposed inner-Tocharian development 'figure, shape' ⇒ 'gesture', the parallels in (7) can be adduced.

(7) Parallels for the semantic development 'figure, shape' ⇒ 'gesture':

i.   Gr. μορφή not only means 'form, shape, beauty of form', but also – especially in the plural – 'gesticulations': cf. the syntagma κατά τε μορφὰς καὶ φωνάς 'through gesticulations and cries' in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 14.9.4), referring to the discomposed and wild way in which barbarians were used to attack enemy armies. The semantics 'gesticulation(s)' of Gr. μορφή is further witnessed by the derivatives Gr. μορφάζω 'gesticulate' (Xen.), μορφασμός 'gesticulation' (Athenaeus), etc. (*LSJ*: 1147; *GEW* 2, 257–258).

ii. Skt. *ākāra-* m. not only means 'form, figure, shape', but also 'external gesture, expression of the face' according to MW: 127.2 (cf. also Chamot-Rooke 2022: 61).

iii. The polysemic Celtic item W *ystum* 'shape, form; posture, gesture; curve, bend' (cf. *GPC* s.v.) belongs to the same word family as Brit. *stum* 'aspect, form; manner', although the exact semantics of the underlying root remains uncertain: 'to bend' according to Greene (1958: 44), Schrijver (1995: 419) and *EDPC*: 356–357, but 'to swell' according to Stüber (1998: 68–69).

Moreover, the assumed development 'figure, shape' ⇒ 'gesture' might have been catalyzed by the occurrence of A *lek** in the binomial expression A *lek pikār* (see 1.1. above), where A *pikār* could have favored the semantic specialization of A *lek* – originally 'figure, shape' – as 'gesture'.[34]

Finally, the examples in (7) above provide further support for the proposed idea of an inner-Tocharian borrowing process with direction A >> B. On the one hand, B *lek** only exhibits the secondary semantics 'gesture'. On the other hand, A *lek* 'gesture' ~ 'figure, shape' still preserves traces of the older meaning 'figure, shape', although the latter is confined to (more or less lexicalized) secondary case forms and was thus on the way of being replaced by the more recent semantics 'gesture'. If speakers of Tocharian B borrowed the basic form A *lek* after the completion of the latter process, A *lek* would have exhibited – by that time – exclusively the secondary meaning 'gesture', which is indeed the only one attested for B *lek**.

4. CONCLUSION

It emerges from the above discussion that the substantives A *lek* 'shape; gesture', B *lek** 'gesture' likely represent a further example of an inner-Tocharian borrowing process with direction A >> B.

4.1. The primary form A *lek* belongs to the PIE root *$*lei̯g$- '(be[come]) equal' and plausibly continues an abstract formation derived from the thematic adjective *$*lei̯g$-ó- 'equal' (> PGerm. *$*lei̯k$-a- 'equal' > ON *líkr* 'id.', etc.). Due to the regular apocope in Tocharian A, it cannot be decided whether this abstract formation ought to be reconstructed as Pre-PToch. *$*lói̯g$-o- – derived

---

[34] I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for having pointed out to me this insightful observation.

from *_leig̑-ó-_ through _o_-substantivization – or as Pre-PToch. *_lóig̑-u-_ (/ *_léig̑-u-_) – derived from *_leig̑-ó-_ through _u_-substantivization. If the latter was the case, *_lóig̑-u-_ / *_léig̑-u-_ (> A [>> B] _lek_) might in turn represent the derivational base of the PK _u_-stem adjective *_léig̑-u-_ / *_lig̑-éu̯-_ 'equal', continued in Lith. _lygùs_ (accent pattern 3) 'equal' with regular application of Winter's Law.

4.2. From a semantic point of view, the original meaning 'equality, identity, correspondence' of Pre-PToch. *_lóig̑-o-_ or *_lóig̑-u-_ (/ *_léig̑-u-_) underwent a two-step evolution. First, it developed to 'figure, shape': such a semantics is still attested in Tocharian A, although it is restricted to the secondary case forms A perlative _lek-ā_ 'with the figure / shape of' and A allative _lek-ac_ (*'toward / close to the figure / shape of' ⇒) 'similar to'. Second, 'figure, shape' further developed to 'gesture', which is the meaning attested for the basic forms A _lek_ and (borrowed) B _lek*_.

A semantic parallel for the first step of the above development is supplied primarily by Germanic, where the etymologically related adjective PGerm. *_leik-a-_ 'equal' was substantivized with the meaning 'equality, identity, correspondence' and then evolved to 'figure, shape' ⇒ 'body (shape)' (cf. Goth. _leik_ n.). A semantic parallel for the second step of the above development can be found primarily in Greek: cf. the substantive μορφή sg. 'shape, form' ~ pl. 'gesticulations' and its verbal derivative μορφάζω 'gesticulate'.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

ABBREVIATIONS

ALEW = Hock, Wolfgang _et al._ 2021. _Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch_. Version 2.0. https://alew.hu-berlin.de/ (last access: 29 May 2023).

BHSD = Edgerton, Franklin 1953. _Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary_. Vol. 2: _Dictionary_. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

CEToM = _A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts_. https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/ (last access: 29 May 2023).

DPEWA = Demiraj, Bardhyl, Olav Hackstein, Fatos Dibra, Giulio Imberciadori, Sergio Neri and Anila Omari 2018–. _Digitales philologisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altalbanischen (15. bis 18. Jahrhundert)_. https://www.dpwa.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary/?lemmaid=9538.

DTA = Carling, Gerd, in collaboration with Georges-Jean Pinault and Werner Winter 2009. _A Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A_. Vol. 1: _Letters a–j_. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

DTB² = Adams, Douglas Q. 2013. _A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged_. [2nd ed.] Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

EDPC = Matasović, Ranko 2009. _Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic_. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

EDPG = Kroonen, Guus 2013. _Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic_. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

EDSIL = Derksen, Rick 2008. _Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon_. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

EWAhd = Lloyd, Albert L. *et al.* 1988–2021. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen*. Thus far 7 vols. Göttingen–Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

EWAia = Mayrhofer, Manfred 1992–2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. 3 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.

GEW = Frisk, Hjalmar 1960–1972. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.

GPC = Thomas, R. J., Gareth A. Bevan and Patrick J. Donovan. *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru. A Dictionary of the Welsh Language*. http://www.welsh-dictionary.ac.uk/.

IEW = Pokorny, Julius 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1. Bern–München: Francke.

JWP = Ji, Xianlin, Werner Winter and Georges-Jean Pinault 1998. *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka of the Xingjiang Museum, China*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

LEW = Fraenkel, Ernst 1962–1965. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.

LIV² = Rix, Helmut *et al.* 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. [2nd ed.] Wiesbaden: Reichert.

LSJ = *The Online Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek-English Lexicon*. In: Maria Pantelia (ed.) *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. A Digital Library of Greek Literature*. http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lsj/#eid=1 (last access: 29 May 2023).

MW = Monier-Williams, Monier 1872. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special References to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Oxford: Clarendon.

REW = Vasmer, Max 1953–1958. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.

TEB = Krause, Wolfgang and Werner Thomas 1960–1964. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.

TG = Sieg, Emil and Wilhelm Siegling, in collaboration with Wilhelm Schulze 1931. *Tocharische Grammatik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

TLT = Poucha, Pavel 1955. *Thesaurus Linguae Tocharicae Dialecti A*. Praha: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

de Bernardo Stempel, Patrizia 1999. *Nominale Wortbildung des älteren Irischen: Stammbildung und Derivation*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Buck, Carl Darling 1949. *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages. A Contribution to the History of Ideas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Carling, Gerd 2000. *Die Funktionen der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.

Carling, Gerd 2021. 'Flat mirror or well-shaped disc? Tocharian A *tāpaki* (B *tapākye*) and A *mukär**.' In: Hannes A. Fellner, Melanie Malzahn and Michaël Peyrot (eds.) *lyuke wmer ra. Indo-European Studies in Honor of Georges-Jean Pinault*. Ann Arbor and New York: Beech Stave, 84–89.

Casaretto, Antje 2004. *Nominale Wortbildung der gotischen Sprache. Die Derivation der Substantive*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Chamot-Rooke, Timothée 2022. 'Back to the caustic lye stream. A revision of the Tocharian fragment A 226 from the *Maitreyāvadānavyākaraṇa*.' *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 21: 5–95.

Couvreur, Walter 1955–1956. 'Bemerkungen zu Pavel Pouchas *Thesaurus linguae tocharicae dialecti A*.' *La Nouvelle Clio* 7–8: 67–98.

Fortson, Benjamin W. 2010. *Indo-European Language and Culture. An Introduction*. [2nd ed.] Malden: Wiley–Blackwell.

Greene, David 1958. 'Miscellanea.' *Celtica* 4: 44–47.

Hackstein, Olav 2019. 'From Possessive to Agentive. The Emergence of Agentivity in Possessive Adjectives.' In: Adam A. Catt, Ronald I. Kim and Brent Vine (eds.) *QAZZU warrai. Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Kazuhiko Yoshida*. Ann Arbor–New York: Beech Stave, 106–122.

Hartmann, Markus 2013. *Das Genussystem des Tocharischen*. Hamburg: Baar.

Heidermanns, Frank 1993. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen Primäradjektive*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.

Hilmarsson, Jörundur 1987. 'Reflexes of I.-E. *$suH_2n̥to$- / -*ōn* "sunny" in Germanic and Tocharian.' *Die Sprache* 33: 56–78.

Hilmarsson, Jörundur 1989. 'Rounding and Exceptions from Rounding in East Tocharian.' *Indogermanische Forschungen* 94: 101–134.

Hilmarsson, Jörundur 1991. *The Nasal Prefixes in Tocharian. A Study in Word Formation*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.

Hilmarsson, Jörundur 1996. *Materials for a Tocharian Historical and Etymological Dictionary*. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.

Höfler, Stefan 2017. *Der Stier, der Stärke hat. Possessive Adjektive und ihre Substantivierung im Indogermanischen*. (PhD diss., University of Vienna, Vienna)

Huard, Athanaric 2020. 'The end of Mahākāśyapa and the encounter with Maitreya – Two Leaves of a Maitreya-Cycle in Archaic TB.' *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 20: 1–82.

Huard, Athanaric 2022. *Recherches sur les textes de méditation en tokharien*. (Ph.D. Diss., Université Paris sciences et lettres, Paris)

Imberciadori, Giulio 2022. 'The Bright Ligurians.' *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 57/1: 81–97.

Imberciadori, Giulio 2023. *Etymologische Untersuchungen zum System der tocharischen Adjektive*. (PhD diss., Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München)

Kim, Ronald 2018. *The Dual in Tocharian: From Typology to* Auslautgesetz. Dettelbach: Röll.

Kim, Ronald 2019. 'Adjectival Suppletion in Tocharian.' In: Ronald I. Kim (ed.) *Diachronic Perspectives on Suppletion*. Hamburg: Baar, 173–192.

Lamberterie, Charles de 1990. *Les adjectifs grecs en -ys: sémantique et comparaison*. 2 vols. Leuven: Peeters.

Lane, George S. 1938. 'Problems of Tocharian Phonology.' *Language* 14: 20–38.

Lane, George S. 1966. 'On the Interrelationship of the Tocharian Dialects.' In: Henrik Birnbaum and Jaan Puhvel (eds.) *Ancient Indo-European Dialects. Proceedings of the Conference on Indo-European Linguistics Held at the University of California, Los Angeles April 25–27, 1963*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 213–233.

Malzahn, Melanie 2005. 'Westtocharische Substantive auf -*au* und einige Fortsetzer von idg. *men*-Stämmen im Tocharischen.' In: Günther Schweiger (ed.) *Indogermanica. Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt. Indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien dem verehrten Jubilar dargebracht zu seinem fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag*. Taimering: Schweiger, 389–407.

Malzahn, Melanie 2017. 'Tocharian and Historical Sociolinguistics: Evidence from a Fragmentary Corpus.' *Open Linguistics* 3/1: 157–177.

Melchert, Craig H. 2010. 'Neuter Stems with Suffix *-(*e*)*n*- in Anatolian and Proto-Indo-European.' *Die Sprache* 47/2: 182–191.

Meunier, Fanny 2013. 'Typologie des locutions en *yām*- du tokharien.' *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 14: 123–185.

Neri, Sergio 2003. *I sostantivi in* -u *del gotico: morfologia e preistoria*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen.

Neri, Sergio 2013. 'Zum urindogermanischen Wort für ‚Hand'.' In: Adam I. Cooper, Jeremy Rau and Michael L. Weiss (eds.) *Multi Nominis Grammaticus. Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in honor of Alan J. Nussbaum, on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave, 185–205.

Neri, Sergio 2017. *Wetter. Etymologie und Lautgesetz*. Perugia: Culture Territori Linguaggi. (http://www.ctl.unipg.it/issues/CTL_14.pdf; last access: 29 May 2023).

Neri, Sergio 2018. 'Review of "dell'Oro, Francesca, *Leggi, leghe suffissali e sistemi "di Caland": storia della questione "Caland" come problema teorico della linguistica indoeuropea"*. *Incontri Linguistici* 41: 146–154.

Nussbaum, Alan J. 1997. 'The "Saussure effect" in Latin and Italic.' In: Alexander M. Lubotsky (ed.) *Sound Law and Analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S. P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 181–203.

Nussbaum, Alan J. 1998. 'Severe Problems.' In: Jay H. Jasanoff, Craig H. Melchert and Lisi Olivier (eds.) *Mír Curad. Studies in honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen, 521–538.

Nussbaum, Alan J. 2017. 'Agentive and Other Derivatives of "τόμος-Type" Nouns.' In: Claire Le Feuvre, Daniel Petit and Georges-Jean Pinault (eds.) *Verbal Adjectives and Participles in Indo-European Languages / Adjectifs verbaux et participes dans les langues indo-européennes. Proceedings of the conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies (Indogermanische Gesellschaft), Paris, 24th to 26th September 2014*. Bremen: Hempen, 233–266.

Pan Tao 2022. 'Review of "Schmidt, Klaus T., *Nachgelassene Schriften"*. *Kratylos* 67: 91–104.

Pedersen, Holger 1909. *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*. Vol. 1: *Einleitung und Lautlehre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Pedersen, Holger 1913. *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*. Vol. 2: *Bedeutungslehre (Wortlehre)*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Peyrot, Michaël 2013. *The Tocharian Subjunctive. A Study in Syntax and Verbal Stem Formation*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Peyrot, Michaël 2015. 'Review of "Adams, Douglas Q., *A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged"*. *Diachronica* 32/1: 131–138.

Pinault, Georges-Jean 1989. 'Introduction au tokharien.' *Lalies* 7: 5–224.

Pinault, Georges-Jean 2006. 'Retour sur le numéral "un" en Tokharien.' *Indogermanische Forschungen* 111: 71–97.

Pinault, Georges-Jean 2008. *Chrestomathie Tokharienne. Textes et grammaire*. Leuven and Paris: Peeters.

Pinault, Georges-Jean 2009. 'On the formation of the Tocharian demonstratives.' In: Elisabeth Rieken and Paul Widmer (eds.) *Pragmatische Kategorien: Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 221–245.

Pinault, Georges-Jean 2015. 'Review of "Hartmann, Markus, *Das Genussystem des Tocharischen"*. *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 110/2: 178–197.

Pinault, Georges-Jean 2017. 'Current issues in Tocharian phonology and etymology.' *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 18: 127–164.

Pinault, Georges-Jean 2020. 'The Dharma of the Tocharians.' In: Vincent Tournier, Vincent Eltschinger and Marta Sernesi (eds.) *Archaeologies of the Written: Indian, Tibetan, and Buddhist Studies in Honour of Cristina Scherrer-Schaub*. Napoli: Unior, 461–492.

Pinault, Georges-Jean 2022. 'Philologie des textes bouddhiques d'Asie centrale.' *Annuaire de l'École pratique des hautes études (EPHE), Section des sciences historiques et philologiques* 153: 520–528.

Pisani, Vittore 1942–1943. 'Glottica Parerga 5. Etimologie tocariche.' *Reale Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, Rendiconti, Classe di Lettere e Scienze Morali e Storiche* 76: 241–254.

Rau, Jeremy 2009. *Indo-European Nominal Morphology: The Decads and the Caland System.* Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen.

Schaffner, Stefan 2020. 'Zur Wortbildung von griechisch ἄγυια, Ἅρπυια, ὄργυια und Verwandtem.' *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 73/1: 157–183.

Schindler, Jochem 1972. 'L'apophonie des nomes-racines indo-européens.' *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 67/1: 31–38.

Schmidt, Klaus T. 1989. *Der Schlußteil des Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins: Text in Sanskrit und Tocharisch A verglichen mit den Parallelversionen anderer Schulen.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Schrijver, Peter 1995. *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Sieg, Emil 1944. 'Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen I.' *Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 16 (Jahrgang 1943): 3–30.

Stüber, Karin 1998. *The Historical Morphology of n-Stems in Celtic.* Maynooth: Department of Old Irish.

Thomas, Werner 1957. *Der Gebrauch der Vergangenheitstempora im Tocharischen.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Thomas, Werner 1972. 'Zweigliedrige Wortverbindungen im Tocharischen.' *Orbis* 21/1: 429–470.

Trautmann, Reinhold 1910. *Die altpreussischen Sprachdenkmäler.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Van Windekens, Albert J. 1976. *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes.* Vol. 1: *La phonétique et le vocabulaire.* Leuven: Centre International de Dialectologie Générale.

de Vries, Jan 1977. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.

Wilkens, Jens 2021. *Handwörterbuch des Altuigurischen. Altuigurisch – Deutsch – Türkisch. Eski Uygurcanın El Sözlüğü. Eski Uygurca – Almanca – Türkçe.* Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.

Winter, Werner 1961. 'Lexical Interchange between 'Tocharian' A and B.' *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 81/3: 271–280.

Winter, Werner 1962. 'Further Evidence of Inter-Tocharian Lexical Borrowing.' *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 82/1: 71–73.