Proceedings of the 34th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference

Los Angeles
October 27th and 28th, 2023

Edited by

David M. Goldstein
Stephanie W. Jamison
Anthony D. Yates

with the assistance of

Angelo Mercado

Cover illustrations:
Wheeled vehicles depicted on Bronze Age vessels and petroglyphs,
from Kuzmina, E. E. (2007) *The Origin of the Indo-Iranians*,
Leiden, Brill; Fig. 34. Reproduced with the kind permission of the author.

Contents

Preface

These Proceedings include papers presented at the Thirty-Fourth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, held on October 27–28, 2023 in Los Angeles.

Special gratitude is owed, first and foremost, to the graduate students comprising the Indo-European Conference Student Organizing Committee, whose dedicated participation and skilled tech-savvy support helped ensure the success of the conference: most especially the conference coordinators Paolo Sabattini, Laura McLean, and Elisa Migliaretti, as well as Joel Erickson, Nick Guymon, Aidan Holmgren, M. I. Rehan, Alex Roy, Arjun Srirangarajan, and Chengzhi Zhang. We are also grateful for significant administrative help from members of the Dodd Humanities Group: Carolyn Attanucci, Paul Gass, and Lena Hoang—and above all, for crucial help and support, Neli Petrosyan and Audrey Yi. We also gratefully acknowledge the financial support furnished by the A. Richard Diebold, Jr. Endowment in Indo-European Studies.

Naturally, we are especially indebted to the scholars whose papers appear below, not only for their stimulating conference presentations, but also for their cooperation and patience throughout the editing process. We owe special thanks, among those scholars, to our featured speakers Blanca María Prósper and Andreas Willi. (As usual, not all papers presented at the conference appear here, for a variety of reasons, including publication or planned publication elsewhere.)

We are also happy to repeat our annual praise of Angelo Mercado for his consummate skill and professionalism in the preparation of the camera-ready copy. This is, finally, our fourth outing with Helmut Buske Verlag: as with the preceding volume in this series, we are deeply grateful to Managing Director Michael Hechinger for his support and guidance throughout the production process, as well as Tim Oliver Pohl and Henrike Judwitt for their counsel on technical matters.

David M. Goldstein, Stephanie W. Jamison, and Anthony D. Yates
September 2024

On Tocharian B *śrāy* pl. 'men'[*]

GIULIO IMBERCIADORI

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

For the Tocharian B lexeme *śrāy* pl. 'men' only plural forms are known thus far. In the present paper I argue that a singular form—namely, the oblique B *śrān* 'man'—is also attested, in B128a3. I then discuss the inner-Tocharian prehistory of B *śrāy* 'men', tracing it back to an *n*-stem Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn- << *$\hat{g}érh_2$-o-n- 'the old one' and showing that all forms attested in Tocharian B can be derived from this pre-form in a regular way. Finally, I address the Indo-European etymology of Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}érh_2$-o-n- 'the old one', which is an individualizing derivative in *-*n*- to the *$h_1reu̯d^h$-ó-* type adjective PIE *$\hat{g}erh_2$-ó- 'old' > Arm. *cer* 'old (person)'.

1 Introduction

The aim of the present contribution is to shed light on the synchronic and diachronic background of the Tocharian B (TB) lexeme *śrāy* pl. 'men'. The paper is structured as follows: (i) in section 2 I provide an overview of the attested forms of B *śrāy* and claim that an oblique singular B *śrān* occurs in B128a3; (ii) in sections 3–5 I discuss the etymology of B *śrāy* from both inner-Tocharian and Indo-European perspectives and contend that the traditionally reconstructed pre-form Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn- regularly explains all forms attested in TB; (iii) in section 4 I summarize the main achievements of the paper.

---

2 Synchronic analysis

2.1 Semantics and attestations

Since Sieg and Siegling 1949 II:36, 178, the nom.pl. B *śrāy* has been translated as 'old (men)'.[1] Carling (2003:84), however, has convincingly shown the correct meaning to be '(sexually mature/adult) men', since in IOL Toch 306b3 (classical; medical text)[2] the gen.pl. B *śrānäts*—for expected *śrānäṃts** with simplification B *-ṃts#* > *-ts#* (Peyrot 2008:69)—translates the gen.pl. *nṛṇām* (to *nṛ-* 'man') in the Sanskrit parallel text; cf. (1). This passage is about uterine cancer (Skt. *rakta-gulma-*), which is said to affect only (sexually mature/adult) women and not (sexually mature/adult) men.

(1)   IOL Toch 306b3

        mā su mäsketär śrānäts (= Skt. *nāsau bhavati nṛṇām*)

        It [i.e., the uterine cancer] does not occur [lit. is/becomes] to [fertile] men.[3]

Based on the meaning 'men (i.e., male human beings)' of the gen.pl. B *śrānäts*, all known attestations of the nom.pl. B *śrāy*[4] and the obl.pl. B *śrānäṃ*[5] can be satisfactorily explained (Carling 2003:84–5). Particularly relevant is the collocation B *śrāy klaiyna* "men [and] women" (SI P/9.11), in which the nom.pl. B *śrāy* functions as antonym of the nom.pl. B *klaiyna* 'women' (sg. *kl(y)iye*).

    It has gone unnoticed so far that the poetic text B432b2S classic (Kaniṣka legend)[6] may also attest a plural form of the lexeme B *śrāy*. Although the context is fragmentary, it seems reasonable to interpret B *śrānaṃts* as a misspelling of the expected gen.pl. B *śrānäṃts** (cf. *śrānäts* in (1) above) and to cautiously translate /// *lyk· ṣṣai lyuwa śrānaṃts ṣa* /// as "… he sent to the men (?)."

    The table in (2) summarizes the discussion above.

---

1   Cf. also *TEB* II:248; *DTB*[1]:644.
2   On the abbreviations used with Tocharian manuscripts, see Malzahn 2007:96–102.
3   Translation after Carling 2003:91.
4   B47a8Š classic; SI P/9.11 late (Pinault 1998:6); SI P/12.1, 5 late (Pinault 1998:18); THT2262a3 (Ilya Itkin, p.c.).
5   B22a1Š classic-late.
6   Thus Athanaric Huard (p.c.). Differently *CEToM*: historical treaty.

(2)

	Sg.	Pl.
Nom.		*śrāy*
Obl.		*śrānäṃ*
Gen.		*śrānäts*
		śrānaṃts (?)

2.2 A "new" attestation

The archaic poetic text B128MQ belongs to the so-called *rājavṛtti* genre (NHG *Fürstenspiegel*), which illustrates the proper conduct of kings (Couvreur 1954:98). In (3) I report the lines a2–a5, and in the following I will focus on the lines a3–a4 (underscored in (3)). Apart from the end of the line a3, where the symbol "–" indicates a missing *akṣara*, the restorations follow the text edition by Sieg and Siegling (1953:62).

(3) B128a2–a5

> *śäk no wäntärwa säkw e(ṣṣeñca)na patäryana waipeccenta alänmeṃ wa(t) (kälpauwa) (•) (kärtse) (waṣamo)* a3 *kärtse aiśämñe krentaunatse soy mañīye yamäṣeñca rekisa • śana al(e)cce śrān m(ā) (– – – – kre-)* a4 *(-ntä)ṃmp≠eṣe śänmälñe pakwāreṃmeṃ tsälpāl(ñ)e • laṃtuññe īke källālñe śkänte toṃ skwän- mane (p)o (śpālmeṃ) (no)* a5 *aiśämñeṣṣe säk*

> Now, [there are] ten things (which give) happiness [to a man]: paternal posses- sions or [possessions] (obtained) from elsewhere, (a good friend), good knowledge, a virtuous son, a servant acting according to [his] word, a wife not (…) a foreign/strange *śrān*, (…) coming together with (good [people]), being released from evils, [and] obtaining the royal position [is] the tenth [thing]. (Now), out of these happinesses, [the] most (excellent) [is] the happiness be- longing to knowledge.[7]

According to Sieg and Siegling (1953:62 n. 4), there is a lacuna of five syllables at the end of line a3, for which they propose a restoration (*ritausa ṣek kre-*) a4 *(-ntä)ṃmp≠eṣe*. Whereas the restoration (*ṣek kre-*) 'always [GOOD]' for the last two syllables is virtually certain, the restoration (*ritausa*) for the first three syllables is less convincing. B *ritausa* is the past participle of the verb B *rit*^{ā}- 'seek, long for' (*TVS*:824) and could potentially mean 'having sought' (active) or 'longed for' (pas- sive) (*TEB* I:185). Despite this, B *ritau* is otherwise attested only with passive se- mantics 'longed for, cherished',[8] which would be syntactically odd here due to the

---

7   My translation.
8   Cf. the attestations on *CEToM* s.v. *ritau*.

presence of a direct object, namely, the obl.sg. B *alecce śrān* "a foreign/strange *śrān*." Moreover, it remains unclear why the action of the wife (B *śana*) should be described in the past tense: note the contrast with the phrase B *mañīye yamāṣeñca* "a servant acting …" (not "having acted") in the immediately preceding sentence.

The passage at hand has also been treated by Couvreur (1954:111), who only offers a Dutch translation without restoration of the Tocharian text. He translates the sentence B *śana al(e)cce śrān m(ā) (– – –)* as "een vrouw die ge(en) vreemde steun (behoeft)." Since Du. *steun* means 'aid, support', Couvreur apparently identified B *śrān* in B128a3 with the independently attested form B *śrāṃ* 'refuge' (B244b2MQ classical), which represents a shortened variant of the substantive B *śarāṃ* 'id.' (← Skt. *śaraṇa-* 'id.'). This interpretation is explicitly assumed in *DTB*²:704, though without translation of B128a3. Couvreur's proposal that B *śana al(e)cce śrān m(ā) (– – –)* means "a wife not (needing?) a foreign refuge" is possible in theory, yet it makes little sense in a list of things that bring happiness to a man.

In (4) I propose an alternative interpretation of B128a3–a4, which is based on two assumptions: (i) the syntagm B obl.sg. *alecce śrān* means "a foreign/strange man" and attests to the obl.sg. belonging to the plural paradigm of B nom. *śrāy* / obl. *śrānäṃ* 'men'; (ii) for the first three syllables of the lacuna at the end of line a3, I restore the *nt*-participle B nom.sg.m./f. *ñäṣṣeñca* 'desiring', which belongs to the paradigm of the verb B *ñäsk-* 'demand, desire' and is independently attested in TB (*TVS*:637).[9]

(4)   Proposed interpretation of B128a3–a4

śana al(e)cce śrān m(ā) (ñäṣṣeñca ṣek kre-) a4 *(-ntä)ṃmp≠eṣe śänmälñe*

A wife not (desiring) a foreign/strange man, (always) coming together with (good [people]).

Compared to the previous hypotheses, this proposal has the following advantages. (i) The restored verb B *ñäsk-* 'demand, desire' can occur with direct objects referring to human beings: cf. IOL Toch 63a2 /// *śpālmeṃ lāntsoś tāᵤ ñäskem* /// "… (they said?) to the excellent queen: 'her we desire …'."[10] (ii) The restored phrase

---

9   Other possible restorations have been kindly pointed out to me by Athanaric Huard (p.c.): (i) *m*-participle B *ynemane* 'going', possibly as a calque of Skt. *paradāraṃ gam-* 'commit adultery'; (ii) nom.sg.f. B *makamña* 'getting excited' (lit. 'running'), cf. the compound B *winā-makañña* (for *winā-makamña**) 'getting excited in [sexual] pleasure' (lit. 'running [into] [sexual] pleasure') which refers to a woman in THT 1543.b+f+d a1 (Huard 2022:504–5, 578).

10 Translation after *CEToM*.

śana [...] *m(ā) (ñäṣṣeñca)* "a wife not (desiring) …" finds a structural parallel in the immediately preceding phrase *mañīye yamāṣeñca* "a servant acting …," in which B *yamāṣeñca* is also an *nt*-participle (to the verb B *yām-* 'do'). (iii) The semantic association between B *śana* 'wife' and B *śrān* 'man' in B128a3 is comparable to the opposition between B *klaiyna* 'women' and B *śrāy* 'men' in SI P/9.11 (see §2.1 above). (iv) The overall sense of the passage becomes much clearer, since a wife not eager to commit adultery makes sense as something that would bring happiness to a man.[11]

2.3 Inner-Tocharian connections?

Ogihara (2014:116, 117) claimed the Tocharian A all.pl. *śräyāsac* (THT1519a2) to be etymologically related to the nom.pl. B *śrāy* 'men' and translated THT1519a2 *la śräyāsac (k)laṣt läc* as "… *Klaṣt* was spent to the elders" (Ogihara 2014:119). However, the nom.pl. B *śrāy* and the all.pl. A *śräyās-ac* do not match formally, since B /-á-/ can hardly correspond to A *-ä-* regularly. Therefore, these forms are best kept distinct from each other; thus also *DTTA*:465, where Carling and Pinault propose a reading A *(śā)laśräyāsac* 'for the craftsmen' and assume a borrowing from Skt. *śālāśraya-* 'dwelling in hall'.

2.4 Local summary

In light of the preceding discussion, the paradigm of B *śrāy* 'men' can now be set up as in (5).

(5)   "New" paradigm of B *śrāy* 'men'

	Sg.	Pl.
Nom.		*śrāy*
Obl.	*śrān*	*śrānäṃ*
Gen.		*śrānäts*
		śrānaṃts (?)

---

11 As kindly pointed out to me by Ilya Itkin, a sequence B *śrằn-* is also attested in the unpublished manuscript THT4064, esp. at the lines a2 (*śrāntsa*) and a3 (*klyaśśa śrantsa*). However, due to the fragmentary context it is difficult to know whether B *śrān-tsa* in a2 is a perlative singular built on the obl.sg. B *śrān* 'man' or rather on the obl.sg. B *śrāṃ* (~ *śarāṃ*) 'refuge' discussed in §2.2 above. Under either account, B *śrantsa* in a3 should be regarded as misspelled for *śrāntsa*. As for *klyaśśa* in a3, this form is obscure. Although a connection with B *kl(y)iye* 'woman' (thus tentatively Ilya Itkin, p.c.) is appealing, the formal details of this proposal remain to be worked out more precisely.

3 Toward a diachronic analysis

B *śrāy* 'men' is universally connected with the PIE root *$\hat{g}erh_2$- 'to age, become old' continued in Ved. *járant-* 'old' and *járate* 'becomes old', Gk. γέρων, -οντος 'old' and ἐγήρᾱ 'became old', etc. (see *DTB*[1]:644 with older proposals).[12]

Peters (2004:267 n. 5) traced B *śrāy* back to an *nt*-stem Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}erh_2$-(e)nt-*, but this pre-form is incompatible with the plural inflection nom. *śrāy* / obl. *śrānäṃ* attested in TB (Del Tomba 2023:107). According to *DTB*[2]:705, B pl. nom. *śrāy* / obl. *śrānäṃ* would go back to a *u*-stem "PIE *$\hat{g}erh_awes$, *$\hat{g}erh_awn̥s$, an ablaut variant of the *$\hat{g}reh_a$-w- seen in Greek *graûs* 'old woman'." However, the obl.sg. B *śrān* 'man' discussed in §2.2 above speaks against this scenario; cf. (6).

(6)   Formal incompatibility of B obl.sg. *śrān* with a *u*-stem pre-form

   i.   Acc.sg. Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}erh_2$-u-m* > PToch. *$k^jərə^n$* > B ×/kʲə́rə/ → ×*śar*, not *śrān*;

   ii.   Acc.sg. Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}erh_2$-u-n-m̥* (with a putative nasal extension) > PToch. *$k^jərənə^n$* > B ×/kʲərə́nə/ → ×*śran*, not *śrān*.

Alternatively, an *n*-stem pre-form was first reconstructed in *DTB*[1]:644; cf. Pre-PToch. "*$ger(h_a)ōn$-*." Since then, the pre-forms in (7) have been proposed.

(7)   Pre-Proto-Tocharian *n*-stem pre-forms proposed for B *śrāy* 'men'

   i.   Nom.pl. *$\hat{g}érh_2$-n-es* or *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn-es* (Pinault ap. Carling 2003:93 n. 47; Pinault 2008:484; 2023:4; Kim 2016:79)

   ii.   Nom.pl *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn-es* (Hackstein, Habata, and Bross 2019:187–8)

   iii. Nom.pl. *$\hat{g}(e)rh_2$-én-es*, *$\hat{g}erh_2$-n-es*, or *$\hat{g}(e)rh_2$-ōn-es* (Höfler 2017:180 with n. 594).

On morphological grounds (see §5.1 below), the reconstruction of an *n*-stem pre-form Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn-* is most likely. In particular, such a pre-form explains nicely both obl. forms attested in TB, namely, the obl.pl. B *śrānäṃ* and the obl.sg. B *śrān*; cf. (8).

(8)   Deriving B obl.pl. *śrānäṃ* and obl.sg. *śrān* from Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn-*

   i.   Acc.pl. Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}erh_2$-ṓn-m̥s* > PToch. *$k^jəranəns$* > B obl.pl. /kʲərа́nən/ → *śrānäṃ*—with regular development Pre-PToch. *°*Vn-m̥s* >

---

12   For the assumption of a meaning 'to age, become old' for the PIE root *$\hat{g}erh_2$-*, which cannot be discussed in detail in the present context, see Steer 2015:159–77.

B *°V́näṃ* as in the obl.pl.m. B *larénäṃ* (~ nom.sg.m. B *lā́re*) 'dear', B *ark-wínäṃ* (~ nom.sg.m. *ā́rkwi*) 'white', etc.;

ii. Acc.sg. Pre-PToch. **ĝerh₂-ṓn-m̥* > PToch. *kʲəranⁿ > B obl.sg. /kʲəránə/ → *śrān*—with regular development Pre-PToch. **°Vn-m̥* > B /°V́nə/ → *°V́ṃ/n* as in the obl.sg. B /səswénə/ → *säsweṃ* (~ nom.sg. *sáswe*) 'lord'.

On the other hand, one would expect the following development to have taken place in the nom.pl.: Pre-PToch. **ĝerh₂-ṓn-es* > PToch. *kʲəranʲə > B nom.pl. ˣ/kʲəránʲə/ → ˣ*śrāñ*, cf. B nom.pl. /səswénʲə/ → *säsweñ* 'lords'. The attested nom.pl. B *śrāy* 'men' is therefore in need of an explanation.

4 Defining the relevant Pre-TB sound change(s)

4.1 The śray rule

The existence of a sound law turning Pre-B **-nʲ(-)* into B *-y(-)* has already been proposed in the literature, although no consensus on its precise conditions has been reached; cf. (9).

(9)   Proposed conditions for the development Pre-B **-nʲ(-)* > B *-y(-)*

i.   PToch. **-ánʲə* > B *-ai* (Hilmarsson 1989:83);

ii.   "Lautwandel /-āñ-/ > /-aiñ-/ mit Verlust des *-ñ-*" (Widmer 2004:162 n. 251);

iii.   Pre-PToch. "**-ōn-es* > **-āñä* > **-āy* sous l'accent" (Pinault 2008:484);

iv.   "**-áñ#* > **-áy#*" and "**-añ* > *-ai*" (Peyrot 2012:185 and 215, respectively);

v.   PToch. "**-áñə#* > pre-TB **-áʸñə#* > TB *-áiñ*" (Del Tomba 2023:165);

vi.   "[P]utative sound change of **-ñ-* to **-i-*" (Jasanoff 2018:76 n. 20);

vii.   "[T]he change of intervocalic **ñ* > **y* is far from assured" (Kim 2018:72 n. 181).[13]

The development in (9.v) has been assumed by Del Tomba (2023:165) in order to explain nom.pl. forms of the type B *oksaiñ** 'oxen'. These forms, however, can be explained instead as secondary formations based on their obl.sg. in *-ai*; see §4.5

---

13   To be sure, other scholars have also assumed a development **nⁱʲ⁾* > **y* for the prehistory of Tocharian: cf. PToch. **nʲ* > **y* / *ś́* __ *ə* (Hilmarsson 1989:109) and Pre-PToch. **n* > **i̯* / *e* __ *ē* (Hackstein 2000:100; 2017:1326–7). However, since it is secure that neither the environment / *ś́* __ *ə* nor / *e* __ *ē* occured in the prehistory of B *śrāy*, I will not further discuss these sound changes in the following.

below. In addition, the nom.pl. B *śrāy* 'men' represents a counterexample to the postulated development PToch. "*-*áñə*# > pre-TB *-*á*^{y}*ñə*# > TB -*áiñ*," since one would expect B *$^×$śraiñ*. Therefore, Del Tomba (2023:165 n. 196) assumes a special development Pre-B "**śráñə* > **śrá*^{y}*ñə* > (**śrá*^{y}*n* >) [B] *śrā́y*," claiming that in "an accented monosyllable […] the apocope of the final nasal could have happened earlier" and that "dissimilation of the two palatals *ś*…*ñ* could have taken place." Nevertheless, it remains unclear why Pre-B **śrá*^{y}*n*—after the presumed apocope of its final nasal—would have been spelled as ⟨*śrāyä*⟩ rather than as $^×$⟨*śrai*⟩ (see immediately below). Furthermore, the occurrence of two palatalized segments within the same word does not seem to be a sufficient condition for triggering a dissimilatory loss of one of them: cf. the nom.pl. B *pyapyaiñ** 'flowers' (attested as *pyāppyaiñ*; see Del Tomba 2023:167), which never exhibits a variant B $^×$*pyapyai*.

   Crucial for understanding the prehistory of the nom.pl. B *śrāy* is its spelling. Specifically, B *śrāy* is not spelled as $^×$⟨*śrai*⟩ with a diphthongal sign (like, e.g., B obl.sg. ⟨*oksai*⟩ 'ox'), but as ⟨*śrāyä*⟩ with two distinct *akṣaras* ⟨*śrā*⟩ (ligature) and ⟨*yä*⟩. This suggests that /a/ and /y/ in B *śrāy* are heterosyllabic and point to an underlyingly trisyllabic structure /k^{j}ə.rá.yə/ (→ ⟨*śrāyä*⟩) rather than to a disyllabic structure $^×$/k^{j}ə́.ray/ (→ $^×$⟨*śarai*⟩) or to a monosyllabic structure $^×$/k^{j}ráy/ (→ $^×$⟨*śrai*⟩).[14] Cf. the substantive B *upāy** 'stratagem', which is spelled in the same way as B *śrāy* and must have been underlyingly trisyllabic—i.e., /u.pá.yə/*—since it is a loanword from Skt. *upāya-* 'id.' (Pinault 2008:441). Crucially, no spelling B $^×$⟨*upai*⟩ (← $^×$/ú.pay/) is attested. Based on the assumption of an underlying structure B /k^{j}ə.rá.yə/, I propose the Pre-TB sound change described in (10) and the derivation of the nom.pl. B *śrāy* presented in (11).

(10)   *Śrāy* rule

Pre-B **n*^{j} > B *y* / $\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ \text{[+accent]} \end{smallmatrix}$ —— *ə* #

A Pre-TB palatal nasal undergoes lenition to a palatal approximant in the environment following an accented **a* and preceding a word-final **ə*.

(11)   Updated derivation of B nom.pl. *śrāy* 'men'

Pre-PToch. **ĝerh₂-ṓn-es* > PToch. **k^{j}əran^{j}ə* > Pre-B **k^{j}ərán^{j}ə* > B /k^{j}əráyə/ → *śrāy*.

---

14   Whether Adams implies the same when he claims that "[t]he nominative plural [B *śrāy*] is underlyingly *śrā-i*" (*DTB*²:705) is unclear to me. On the TB word-final sequence -*āy*, see further Ringe 1996:xxii–xxiii.

A derivation similar to that in (11) has been assumed by Pinault, who proposed a development B *śrāy* < "**śärä́yä* < **śärä́ñä*" (2008:484; see also (9.iii) above) and explained it on the basis of the "phonetic rule discovered by Winter" (ap. Carling 2003:93 n. 47). In the present paper, however, I argue that "**śärä́yä*" (or, in the above notation, /kʲəráyə/) is not the direct ancestor of the nom.pl. B *śrāy* but rather the form synchronically underlying it. Moreover, I assume that the "phonetic rule discovered by Winter" is not responsible for the development of *-y* in B *śrāy*; see §4.2 below.

4.2 The śray *rule vs. the* klyomai *rule*

Another crucial point in my argument is in fact the necessity of keeping the Pre-TB *śrāy* rule as stated in (10) distinct from another Pre-TB sound law, which was proposed by Winter (1987:306) in order to explain (among other things) the synchronically isolated voc.sg. of the adjective B *klyomo* 'noble', namely, *klyomai*; cf. (12).[15]

    (12)   "Tocharian Winter's Law" and the derivation of the voc.sg. B *klyomai* 'o noble'

        i.   Pre-B $*n > $ B y / $\overset{a}{\underset{[-\text{accent}]}{}}$ — #

              A Pre-TB alveolar nasal undergoes lenition to a palatal approximant in the environment following an unaccented **a* and preceding the right edge of a word;[16]

        ii.   Pre-PToch. sg. nom. **k̂léu̯-mōn-s* / voc. **k̂léu̯-mōn* > PToch. **klʲomõ* / **klʲuman*, whereby the voc.sg. **klʲuman* >> (after the nom.sg. **klʲomõ*) **klʲoman* > Pre-B **klʲóman* > B /klʲó.may/ → *klyomai*.

The assumption of the sound change in (12.i), which I will call the *klyomai* rule, also enabled Winter (1987:305–7) to convincingly explain the sequence *ylai-* that

---

15   Since voc.sg. forms in B *-ai* otherwise occur only beside nom.sg. forms in B *-a* (*TEB* I:103), the inflectional pattern B sg. nom. *klyomo* : voc. *klyomai* is synchronically isolated and thus likely to reflect an old ablaut alternation. The alternative assumption that the vocative marker *-ai* (← /-ay/) in B *klyomai* had spread analogically from forms with nom.sg. in B *-a* (Pinault 2008:476) is unattractive, since one would then expect a voc.sg. B ˣ*klyomoy* rather than *klyomai*—cf. B sg. nom. *aiṣṣeñca* 'giving' : voc. *aiṣṣeñcai* = nom. *klyomo* 'noble' : voc. X, X = ˣ*klyomoy*. As a further alternative, one might regard *-ai* in the voc.sg. B *klyomai* as diachronically identical with the obl.sg. ending *-ai* of the type B *oksai* 'ox'. However, the refunctionalization of an oblique as a vocative would be hard to explain.

16   Cf. also Winter 1989:115–6; Lubotsky 1994:67.

occurs in the theonym B *ylai-ñäkte* (: A *wlāṃ-ñkät*) 'Indra'. Winter traced B *ylai-* back to a lexicalized voc.sg. that originally belonged to the paradigm of the Tocharian 'king' word, namely, B *walo*, A *wäl* << Pre-PToch. *$u̯élH$-ont- / *$u̯l̥H$-$n̥t$-´. Building on Winter, I claim in (13) that B *ylai-ñäkte* and A *wlāṃ-ñkät* arose through independent univerbations of a Proto-Tocharian syntagm voc.sg. *$w^jəlan$ *$n^jəktæ$ 'o King God (i.e., Indra)'; cf. PIE voc.sg. *$d̯i̯éu̯$ *ph_2ter 'o Sky Father' → (univerbation) Lat. *Iū-piter* 'Jupiter'.

(13)   Derivation of B *ylai-ñäkte* 'Indra' through the *klyomai* rule

Pre-PToch. sg. nom. *$u̯élH$-*ōnt-s* (>> *$u̯l̥H$-*ōnt-s* > B *walo*, A *wäl*) / voc. *$u̯élH$-*ōnt*, whereby the voc.sg. *$u̯élH$-*ōnt* > *$u̯el'ōn$* > PToch. *$w^jəlan$* → syntagm *$w^jəlan$ *$n^jəktæ$ 'o King God' > 'Indra' > (i) Pre-A *$wəlān$ *$n^jəkta$ → (univerbation) *$wəlān$-*$n^jəkta$ > A *wlāṃ-ñkät* 'id.', (ii) Pre-B *$yəlan$ *$n^jə́kte$ > *$yə́lay$ *$n^jə́kte$* → (univerbation) B /$yəláy$-$n^jəkte$/ → *ylai-ñäkte* 'id.'.[17]

The discussion above shows that the *klyomai* and the *śrāy* rule differ from each other in two crucial respects: (i) their application environment, namely, Pre-B / $\underset{[-\text{accent}]}{a}$ ___ # (*klyomai* rule) vs. Pre-B / $\underset{[+\text{accent}]}{a}$ ___ *ə* # (*śrāy* rule); (ii) their target, namely, Pre-B *n (*klyomai* rule) vs. Pre-B *n^j (*śrāy* rule). Moreover, although both sound laws yield a new segment B /y/, their outcomes are clearly distinct at the graphic level: the *klyomai* rule leads to a tautosyllabic (i.e., diphthongal) sequence B /°ay./ → ⟨°*ai*⟩, cf. B voc.sg. *klyomai* 'o noble'; the *śrāy* rule leads instead to a heterosyllabic sequence B /°á.yə/ → ⟨°*āyä*⟩, cf. B nom.pl. *śrāy* 'men'.

Despite this, the *klyomai* rule as stated in (12.i) above has been reformulated by several scholars in the past decades; cf. (14).

(14)   Proposed reformulations of the *klyomai* rule

i.   Pre-PToch. *-*ōn-m̥* > PToch. *-*anə^n* > Pre-B *-*anə* > *-*ay* > B -*ai* (Pinault 2008:485)—see also Pinault 2008:512 ("diphthongaison de *-*ān(ä)* accentué") and Hajnal 2005:237, 240 ("Wandel von B Obl.Sg. */-an(ä)#/ > B -*ai*");

ii.   Pre-PToch. *-*ōn* > PToch. *-*ay* (Malzahn 2011:95 n. 30);

iii.   "Winter's sound law *-*án#* > -*ai*#" (Peyrot 2012:215, but "*-*an* > *-*ai*" at p. 183).

---

17   Differently Peyrot (2012:184) and Del Tomba (2023:164): Pre-B *ylan-ñəkte* > *ylañ-ñəkte* > B *ylai-ñäkte*. However, no parallels for the assumed development Pre-B *°*añ-ñ*° > B °*ai-ñ*° are adduced.

None of these reformulations is convincing. The development assumed in (14.i.) is contradicted by the fact that a sequence Pre-B *-*V́nə* never undergoes apocope of its final *-ə* at the underlying level—cf. B obl.sg. /səswénə/ → *säsweṃ* (~ nom.sg. *sáswe*) 'lord', B obl.sg.m. /larénə/ → *lareṃ* (~ nom.sg.m. *lā́re*) 'dear', etc. Accordingly, the regular outcome of a sequence Pre-B *-ánə* is B /-ánə/ → *-āṃ*/*n*, as shown by the obl.sg. B /kʲəránə/ → *śrān* 'man' in (8.ii) above. As for (14.ii.), it does not seem warranted to assume that a development *n* > *y* / $_{[-\text{accent}]}^{a}$ __ # had already taken place in Proto-Tocharian, since the preservation of the final nasal in the petrified voc.sg. Pre-A *wəlān* 'o King' (→ A *wlāṃ-ñkät* 'Indra') as against its lenition in Pre-B *yə́lan* > *yə́lay* (→ B *ylai-ñäkte* 'id.') ensures that the latter process must have taken place in the prehistory of TB. In (14.iii) the reconstruction of an accented input sequence Pre-B *-án* is contradicted by both Pre-B *klʲóman* (> B *klyomai*) and Pre-B *yə́lan* > *yə́lay* (→ B *ylai-ñäkte*).

4.3 Interim conclusions on pre-TB sound changes

For Pre-TB I assume the existence of two different sound laws, which I label as the *klyomai* and *śrāy* rules respectively. The former—i.e., Pre-B *n* > B *y* / $_{[-\text{accent}]}^{a}$ __ # —explains the voc.sg. B *klyomai* 'o noble' and the sequence *ylai-* in the theonym B *ylai-ñäkte* (: A *wlāṃ-ñkät*) 'Indra'. The latter—i.e., Pre-B *nʲ* > B *y* / $_{[+\text{accent}]}^{a}$ __ *ə* #—explains the nom.pl. B *śrāy* 'men'.

4.4 Apparent counterexamples to the śrāy rule

If the proposed formulation of the *śrāy* rule is correct, one should never find words ending in *-āñ* (← /-ánʲə/) in TB. To be sure, although the final sequence B *-āñ* is rare, some counterexamples are met. In the present section, I will show them to be inconclusive.

Cases like 3sg.pret.-I B *krasā-ñ* 'was angry' (B400b1S classic-late), causal.sg. B *kawā-ñ* 'out of desire' (PKAS7Lb3DA classic-late), or nom.pl. B *läkle-lyakāñ* 'seeing suffering' (PKAS7Ea6DA classic) are irrelevant, since here B *-ñ* is an enclitic personal pronoun, a case ending, or is preceded by an ⟨ā⟩ misspelled for expected ⟨a⟩ (see Del Tomba 2023:166 n. 197, with discussion of further forms). As for B nom./obl.sg. *sāñ* 'artifice, expedient' (: A *ṣāñ* 'id.'), it is a loanword from LKhot. *saña-* 'id.' (Del Tomba and Maggi 2021; Dragoni 2023:189). Since in Late Khotanese final short vowels have been lost (Dragoni 2023:219), one may surmise that this word was borrowed as (late) PToch. *sánʲ* rather than *sánʲə*. Therefore, due to the absence of *-ə#*, no development Pre-B *nʲ* > B *y* took place.

The most conspicuous group of counterexamples is represented by the nom.pl. forms in B -*āñ* (← /-án^{j}ə/) belonging to the nominal subclass VI.3b; cf. B *tanā́ñ* 'seeds', *katsā́ñ* 'bellies', etc. (*TEB* I:135–6; Del Tomba 2023:111–2). However, as (15) shows, these plurals are formed according to a synchronically productive rule that applies to most members of the nominal class VI.3 (*TEB* I:132–7) and that consists of adding the syllabic nom.pl. ending B /-n^{j}ə/ → -*ñ* to an obl.sg. form ending in /-V(y)/ (cf. also Del Tomba 2023:165 n. 195; Pinault 2008:485).

(15)   Obl.sg.-based formation of the nom.pl. in the TB class VI.3

   i.   Obl.sg. *ri* : nom.pl. *ri-ñ* 'city'—subclass VI.1a;

   ii. Obl.sg. *kálymi* : nom.pl. *kälymí-ñ*[18] 'direction'—subclass VI.1b;

   iii. Obl.sg. *pyā́pyai* : nom.pl. *pyapyái-ñ*[19] 'flower'—subclass VI.2a;

   iv. Obl.sg. *arṣā́klai* : nom.pl. (*arṣā́klai-ñ* >) *arṣā́kla-ñ*[20] 'snake'—subclass VI.3a.

Accordingly, I claim that the paradigmatic pressure of the obl.sg. B *tā́na*, *kā́tsa*, etc. blocked the regular development Pre-B *-*án^{j}ə* > B /-áyə/ in the nom.pl. B *tanā́ñ*, *katsā́ñ*, etc.; cf. (16).

(16)   Proportional analogy explaining final B -*āñ* in the subclass VI.3b

   B obl.sg. *kálymi* : nom.pl. *kälymí-ñ** 'direction' = obl.sg. *pyā́pyai* : nom.pl. *pyapyái-ñ** 'flower' = obl.sg. *tā́na* : nom.pl. X 'seed', X = *tanā́-ñ*—not ×*tanā́y*.

Crucially, in the paradigm of B *śrāy* 'men' the obl.sg. was B *śrān* (see §2.2 above). Since the latter did not end in -*a*, no analogical restoration *śrāy* >> ×*śrā-ñ* took place in the nom.pl. I therefore conclude that the synchronically isolated nom.pl. B *śrāy* as a *lectio difficilior* preserves the regular outcome of a sequence Pre-B *-*án^{j}ə*# in TB.

---

18   Attested as *kälymiṃ* (B108b6S late); see Del Tomba 2023:169.

19   Attested as *pyāppyaiñ* (B275a2MQ archaic) and *pyapyaiṃ* (PKAS6Da3DA classic); see Del Tomba 2023:167.

20   Misspelled as *arṣaklañ* in PKNS39a3DA classic. For the regular simplification B *ay* > *a* / $_{\text{[+accent]}}C_x$ __ *C*, cf. B obl.sg. *peñiyai* 'splendor' → adjective (*peñiyai-tstse* >) *peñíya-tstse** 'splendid' (Peyrot 2012:184).

4.5 Obl.sg. B śrān *'man' vs. obl.sg. B* oksai *'ox'*

Finally, one might ask why the *n*-stem Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}$érh₂-ōn-* yielded an obl.sg. B *śrān* 'man', whereas the *n*-stem Pre-PToch. *$(h_2)uK(-)s$-ōn-* 'ox'[21] led to an obl.sg. B *oksai* 'id.' belonging to the nominal subclass VI.2a (*TEB* I:133–4).

I claim the answer lies in the fact that B *śrān* 'man' continues an *n*-stem with the semantic feature [+human]. Consequently, the inherited obl.sg. PToch. *k^jəranⁿ* > Pre-B *k^jəranə* 'man' was morphologically segmented as *k^jəra-nə* and preserved as such in B /kʲərá-nə/ → *śrān*, where the final sequence /-nə/ marked the feature [+human]—cf. B obl.sg. /səswé-nə/ → *säsweṃ* 'lord'. In contrast, the inherited (acc.sg. Pre-PToch. *$(h_2)uK(-)s$-ōn-m̥* >) obl.sg. PToch. *oksanⁿ* > Pre-B *oksanə* 'ox' was morphologically segmented as *oksa-nə* but then reshaped as Pre-B *oksa* due to its semantic feature [−human]—cf. B obl.sg. /yə́kwe/ (not ˣ/yəkwé-nə/) → *yakwe* 'horse'.[22] I further assume that the nom.sg. B *okso* (< Pre-PToch. *$(h_2)uK(-)s$-ōn-s*) subsequently triggered an analogical restructuring of the expected obl.sg. B ˣ*oksa* (type B *kantwa* 'tongue', subclass VI.3b) as *oksai* due to its phonetic similarity (cf. the structure *o…o*) with forms like B *prosko* 'fear', *yoko* 'thirst', *ścono* 'hatred', etc. Since the latter forms—continuing old *eh₂*-stems—belonged to the nominal subclass VI.2a (Del Tomba 2023:153), TB 'ox' was analogically transferred to this inflectional class; cf. (17). Notably, disyllabic items with the structure *o…o* in the nom.sg. are particularly frequent in the TB subclass VI.2a but missing in the subclass VI.3b.[23]

(17) Analogical transfer of TB 'ox' to the subclass VI.2a via nom.sg. *okso*

Sg. nom. *prosko* : obl. *proskai* 'fear' = nom. *yoko* : obl. *yokai* 'thirst' = nom. *ścono* : obl. *śconai* 'hatred' = nom. *okso* : obl. X 'ox', X = *oksai*—not ˣ*oksa*.

Finally, the obl.sg. B *óksai* (← /óksay/) functioned as base for the creation of the nom.pl. B *oksái-ñ* * (← /oksáy-nʲə/)[24] according to the productive pattern described in (15) above.

---

21 Cf., with diverging etymological analyses, Pinault 2008:432–3 and Höfler 2017:6–40; differently Jasanoff 2018, esp. 75–7, who sets up an *oi̯*-stem.

22 A comparable scenario has been proposed by Jasanoff (2018:77) in order to explain the paradigm B sg. nom. *kaurṣe* / obl. *kaurṣ** 'bull'. For the assumption of a semantically driven truncation of substantives with the feature [–human] in Tocharian, see Hilmarsson 1987:46.

23 Cf. the forms attested for these subclasses in Del Tomba 2023:147 and 111–2, respectively.

24 Attested as *oksaiṃ* (PKAS15Bb3 classic); see Del Tomba 2023:167.

5 The derivation and prehistory of Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn-

5.1 Historical morphology

As proposed by several scholars,[25] the *n*-stem pre-form Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn- is best analyzed as an individualizing derivative in *-*n*- to an underlying adjective PIE *$\hat{g}erh_2$-ó- 'old' (type PIE *$h_1re\underset{.}{u}d^h$-ó- 'red'), which is continued in Arm. *cer*, -*oy* 'old (person)' (*EDAIL*:339). Accordingly, this individualizing derivative must have originally exhibited a stem *$\hat{g}érh_2$-*o*-*n*-. The lengthened ō-grade (cf. Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn-) likely arose in the nom.sg., where a development *$\hat{g}érh_2$-*o*-*n*-*s* > (Szemerényi's Law) *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ō-*n* >> (resegmentation) *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn took place. Subsequently, the stem allomorph of the nom.sg. underwent intraparadigmatic generalization, thus yielding the stem *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn- continued in Tocharian. For the latter process, parallels are known: (i) within Tocharian, cf. the acc.sg. Pre-PToch. *$\underset{.}{u}lH$-ónt-$\underset{.}{m}$ >> (after the nom.sg. *$\underset{.}{u}lH$-ōnt-*s*) *$\underset{.}{u}lH$-ṓnt-$\underset{.}{m}$ > PToch. *(w)lantə^n > obl.sg. AB *lānt* 'king'; (ii) from other Indo-European languages, cf. the invariable stem Lat. *Catōn*- and Gk. Στράβων- of the so-called *Catō* and Στράβων types (Schaffner 2005:199, 200, 269–70).

As sections 3–4 have shown, TB directly continues the acc.sg., nom.pl., and acc.pl. of the individualizing *n*-stem Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn-. As for the nom.sg. *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn (< *$\hat{g}érh_2$-*o*-*n*-*s*), its expected inner-Tocharian development is presented in (18).

(18)   Expected development of the nom.sg. Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn

*$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn >> (recharacterization) *$\hat{g}érh_2$-ōn-*s* > (*s*#-loss with compensatory lengthening)[26] *ger$H\tilde{\tilde{o}}n$ > *ger'$\tilde{\tilde{o}}$ > PToch. *$k^j ə r \tilde{o}$ > B /k^{j}əro/* → śaro*.

The expected nom.sg. B *śaro** 'man' has not yet been found in the TB corpus.[27]

Notably, the individualizing *n*-stem Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}érh$-$_2o$-*n*- may find a structural parallel in the *nt*-stem PIE *$\hat{g}érh_2ont$- 'old (person)' (> Ved. *járant*- 'old', Oss. *zærond* 'id.', Gk. γέρων 'old (person)'), if the latter is to be segmented as *$\hat{g}érh_2$-*o*-*nt*- and represents an individualizing derivative in *-*nt*- (type Hitt. *irmala-nt*- 'ill')[28] based on the adjective PIE *$\hat{g}erh_2$-ó- 'old' (> Arm. *cer* 'old (person)')—thus Klingenschmitt ap. Schaffner 2001:615–6 and Oettinger (2001:303).

---

25   Cf. Pinault 2008:484; 2023:4; Höfler 2017:180; Hackstein, Habata, and Bross 2019:187–8.

26   On this process, see Pinault 2008:421, 431.

27   Remarkably, a nom.sg. B *śaro** is also set up by Peters (2004:267 n.5; cf. also Malzahn 2011:84), though he derives it from Pre-PToch. "*gerăn(t)s*."

28   On which see, among others, Melchert 2000:68–70; Oettinger 2001.

The morphological relationships involved would be the same as in PGerm. *$aru̯a$- 'ready, quick' (> ON *o̜rr* 'id.') ~ PIAr. *$áru̯an$- 'the quick one' (> Ved. *árvan*- m. 'runner, horse') ~ PIIr. *$áru̯ant$- 'the quick one' (> OAv. YAv. *auruuaṇt*- 'quick; m. runner', Ved. *árvant*- m. 'runner, horse')—thus Schaffner 2001:616 with n. 162.

Nevertheless, since some derivatives of the PIE root *$ĝerh_2$- participated in the Caland system (Stüber 2002:83–4), one cannot exclude that PIE *$ĝérh_2ont$- 'old (person)' rather was an *nt*-stem Caland formation of the type Gk. κρέων, -οντος m. 'ruler', ἑκών (fem. ἑκοῦσα) 'readily', Ved. *bṛhánt*- 'high', etc. (Rau 2009:71–2; Löwe 2014:174–5) and should therefore be segmented as *$ĝérh_2$-ont-.[29]

5.2 Semantics

Since Pre-PToch. *$ĝérh_2$-o-n- must have originally meant 'the old one', I claim the meaning 'man' attested in TB to have arisen through a semantic development 'the old one (masculine)' > 'the mature one' > 'the adult one' > 'man (i.e., male human being)'. That such a development was possible is shown by Germanic, where—as noted by Carling (2003:92)—some derivatives of the PIE root *$ĝerh_2$- 'to age, become old' exhibit the same basic meaning as B *śrāy*: cf. OE *ceorl* m. 'free man', MHG *kerl(e)* m. 'man, husband', NHG *Kerl* m. 'fellow, person' ~ OHG *kar(a)l* m. '(strong) man, husband', etc. < PGerm. *$χe/arla$- < Pre-PGerm. *$ĝé/ór(h_2)$-lo- (*EWAhd* V:411–4; Neri 2016:24).

5.3 Extra-Tocharian equations?

Höfler (2017:180 n. 595) tentatively identified an extra-Tocharian equation with B *śrāy* 'men' in the Armenian form *cerun* 'old (person)' (*Book of Chries*; *EDAIL*: 339). This proposal is appealing, as an acc.sg. PIE *$ĝerh_2$-ó-n-m̥ or Pre-PArm. *$ĝerh_2$-ṓn-m̥ (cf. B obl.sg. *śrān*) would have led to PArm. *$cerúnan$ > (post-tonic syncope) *$cerúnn$ > Arm. *cerun*, subsequently refunctionalized as nom./acc.sg (cf. Arm. nom./acc.sg. *garun* 'spring' < Pre-PArm. acc.sg. *$u̯esar-on-m̥$).[30] One should then assume that °*nn* (not °*n*) in Arm. *inn* 'nine' < PArm. *$énun$ (Klingenschmitt 1982:235 n. 7) would have been kept in order to avoid a hyper-short outcome ˣ*in* (Rémy Viredaz, p.c.).

---

29 PIE *$ĝérh_2ont$- can hardly be an *nt*-participle of the type PIE *$bʰér$-o-nt- 'bearing' because one would then expect a meaning 'aging' rather than 'old (person)'. For a still different analysis of PIE *$ĝérh_2ont$-, see Steer 2015:171–2.

30 See *EDAIL*:201, with references.

To be sure, Arm. *cerun* also allows for alternative pre-forms: e.g., PIE *$\hat{g}erh_2$-*u-no-* or *$\hat{g}\acute{e}rh_2$-*o-mh$_1$no-* (cf. Klingenschmitt 1982:257 n. 16). The former pre-form, however, would lack an exact extra-Armenian match; the latter, instead, would have meant 'aging, becoming old' and would therefore not explain the semantics 'old (person)' of Arm. *cerun* straightforwardly. According to Olsen (1989: 223), Arm. *cerun* goes back to PIE *$\hat{g}\acute{e}rh_2ont$-* 'old (person)' (see §5.1 above). Again, one should start from the acc.sg. PIE *$\hat{g}erh_2\acute{o}nt$-$\dddot{m}$* and assume a development to PArm. *$cer\acute{u}nan$* > *$cer\acute{u}nn$* > Arm. *cerun*. Nevertheless, the exact conditions under which PIE *-nt(-)* yielded Arm. *-n(-)* rather than *-nd(-)* are debated (cf. Batisti 2020:26–8 with references, 43). Finally, Rémy Viredaz (p.c.) suggests that Arm. *cerun* 'old (person)' might simply be a late enlargement of Arm. *cer* 'id.' (see §5.1 above) by means of the suffix *-un* (on which see Olsen 1999:601–8).

In sum, despite the formal ambiguity of the Armenian word, the assumption of an equation B obl.sg. *śrān* 'man' = Arm. *cerun* 'old (person)' remains possible and is even likely.[31]

6 Conclusions

In this paper I argued that beside the plural forms nom. *śrāy* / obl. *śrānäṃ* 'men' also a singular form—namely, obl. *śrān* 'man' (B128a3)—is attested in TB. This confirms the reconstruction of an individualizing *n*-stem pre-form *$\hat{g}\acute{e}rh_2$-*o-n-* >> *$\hat{g}\acute{e}rh_2$-*ōn-*, which may also be continued in Arm. *cerun* 'old (person)' and underwent an inner-Tocharian semantic development 'the old one (masculine)' > 'the mature one' > 'the adult one' > 'man (i.e., male human being)'. The expected acc.sg. Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}erh_2$-*ṓn-$\dddot{m}$* yielded regularly the obl.sg. B /kʲəránə/ → *śrān*. Similarly, the expected nom.pl. Pre-PToch. *$\hat{g}\acute{e}rh_2$-*ṓn-es* led regularly to the nom.pl. B /kʲərā́yə/ → *śrāy* due to the application of a sound law Pre-B *n^j* > B *y* / $_{\substack{a\\ [+\text{accent}]}}$ ___ *ə* #, which I have called the *śrāy* rule. Finally, I contended that the diphthong /-ay(-)/ in the voc.sg. B *klyomai* 'o noble' and the theonym B *ylai-ñäkte* 'Indra' did not arise through the *śrāy* rule but through a different Pre-TB sound change, which I labelled the *klyomai* rule—i.e., Pre-B *n* > B *y* / $_{\substack{a\\ [-\text{accent}]}}$ ___ #.

---

31 Beside Arm. *cerun*, also a form *ceruni* 'old person' (Bible, 2×) is attested; cf. *EDAIL*:339. Since Arm. *ceruni* is apparently a term of respect (Rémy Viredaz, p.c.), it may represent a reshaping of Arm. *cerun* 'old (person)' by analogy to Arm. *ṙ/rabbuni* 'teacher'. For a different explanation, see Olsen 1989:224.

References

Batisti, Roberto. 2020. Some Putative Greco-Armenian Sound Laws and the Role of the Accent. In Luka Repanšek, Harald Bichlmeier, and Velizar Sadovski (eds.), vácā́ṁsi miśrā́ kr̥ṇavāmahai*: Proceedings of the International Conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies and IWoBA XII, Ljubljana 4–7 June 2019, Celebrating One Hundred Years of Indo-European Comparative Linguistics at the University of Ljubljana*, 25–48. Hamburg: Baar.

Carling, Gerd. 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. *Historische Sprachforschung* 116.75–95.

CEToM = University of Vienna. *A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts*. https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/ (accessed 6 February 2024).

Couvreur, Walter. 1954. Koetsjische literaire fragmenten uit de Berlijnse verzameling (naar aanleiding van Sieg & Siegling's *Tocharische Sprachreste*). *Handelingen der Zuid-nederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal- en Letterkunde en Geschiedenis* 8.97–117.

Del Tomba, Alessandro. 2023. *The Tocharian Gender System: A Diachronic Study in Nominal Morphology*. Leiden: Brill.

Del Tomba, Alessandro, and Mauro Maggi. 2021. A Central Asian Buddhist Term: Remarks on Khotanese *saña-* and Tocharian B *sāñ*, A *ṣāñ*. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 64(3).199–240.

Dragoni, Federico. 2023. Watañi lāntaṃ*: Khotanese and Tumshuqese Loanwords in Tocharian*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

DTB[1] = Douglas Q. Adams. 1999. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

DTB[2] = ———. 2013. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B, Revised and Greatly Enlarged*[2]. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

DTTA = Gerd Carling and Georges-Jean Pinault. 2023. *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

EDAIL = Hrach Martirosyan. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.

EWAhd = Albert L. Lloyd, Otto Springer, Karen K. Purdy, and Rosemarie Lühr. 1988–2021. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen*. 7 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Hackstein, Olav. 2000. Review of Jörundur Hilmarsson, *Materials for a Tocharian Historical and Etymological Dictionary*. *Kratylos* 45.96–104.

———. 2017. The Phonology of Tocharian. In Jared S. Klein, Brian D. Joseph, and Matthias A. Fritz (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics* II, 1304–34. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hackstein, Olav, Hiromi Habata, and Christoph Bross. 2019. *Tocharische Texte zur Buddhalegende*. Dettelbach: Röll.

Hajnal, Ivo. 2005. Die Flexion der -ah_2-Stämme im Tocharischen: Ererbt oder geneuert?. In Günther Schweiger (ed.), *Indogermanica: Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt. Indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien dem verehrten Jubilar dargebracht zu seinem fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag*, 221–45. Taimering: Schweiger.

Hilmarsson, Jörundur. 1987. The Element -ai(-) in the Tocharian Nominal Flexion. *Die Sprache* 33.34–55.

———. 1989. *The Dual Forms of Nouns and Pronouns in Tocharian*. Reykjavík: Málvís-indastofnun Háskóla Íslands.

Höfler, Stefan. 2017. Der Stier, der Stärke hat: Possessive Adjektive und ihre Substantiv-ierung im Indogermanischen. Ph.D. diss., University of Vienna.

Huard, Athanaric. 2022. Recherches sur les textes de méditation en tokharien. Ph.D. diss., University of Paris.

Jasanoff, Jay H. 2018. The Phonology of Tocharian B *okso* 'ox'. In Lucien van Beek, Alwin Kloekhorst, and Guus Kroonen (eds.), *Farnah: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honour of Sasha Lubotsky*, 72–8. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.

Kim, Ronald I. 2016. Review of *DTB*². *Kratylos* 61.74–95.

———. 2018. *The Dual in Tocharian: From Typology to* Auslautgesetz. Dettelbach: Röll.

Klingenschmitt, Gert. 1982. *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Löwe, John J. 2014. Indo-European Caland Adjectives in *-nt- and Participles in Sanskrit. *Historische Sprachforschung* 127.166–195.

Lubotsky, Alexander. 1994. The Original Paradigm of the Tocharian Word for 'King'. In Bernfried Schlerath (ed.), *Tocharisch: Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*, 66–72. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.

Malzahn, Melanie. 2007. Tocharian Texts and Where to Find Them. In Melanie Malzahn (ed.), *Instrumenta Tocharica*, 79–112. Heidelberg: Winter.

———. 2011. Speaking on Tongue—the Tocharian B Nouns with an Oblique Singular in -a. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12.83–109.

Melchert, H. Craig. 2000. Tocharian Plurals in -nt- and Related Phenomena. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 9.53–75.

Neri, Sergio. 2016. Review of Guus Kroonen, *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. *Kratylos* 61.1–51.

Oettinger, Norbert. 2001. Neue Gedanken über das -nt-Suffix. In Onofrio Carruba and Wolfgang Meid (ed.), *Anatolisch und Indogermanisch / Anatolico e Indoeuropeo: Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Pavia, 22.–25. September 1998*, 301–15. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen.

Ogihara, Hirotoshi. 2014. Fragments of Secular Documents in Tocharian A. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 15.103–29.

Olsen, Birgit Anette. 1989. A Trace of Indo-European Accent in Armenian. *Historische Sprachforschung* 102(2).220–40.

———. 1999. *The Noun in Biblical Armenian: Origin and Word-Formation—with Special Emphasis on the Indo-European Heritage*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Peters, Martin. 2004. On Some Greek *nt*-Formations. In John H. W. Penney (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, 266–76. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Peyrot, Michaël. 2008. *Variation and Change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

———. 2012. The Tocharian A Match of the Tocharian B Obl.Sg. -*ai*. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 13.181–220.

Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1998. Economic and Administrative Documents in Tocharian B from the Berezovsky and Petrovsky Collections. *Manuscripta Orientalia* 4(4).3–20.

———. 2008. *Chrestomathie tokharienne: Textes et grammaire*. Leuven: Peeters.

———. 2023. Denominative Verbs without Apparent Suffix. Paper presented at the conference "Deadjectival Verb Formation in Indo-European," Vienna, 10 March 2023. Handout available on line at https://deadjectivals.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/pinaulthandout2023.pdf, accessed 6 February 2024.

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

Ringe, Donald A. 1996. *On the Chronology of Sound Changes in Tocharian* I: *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Tocharian*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.

Schaffner, Stefan. 2001. *Das Vernersche Gesetz und der innerparadigmatische grammatische Wechsel des Urgermanischen im Nominalbereich*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen.

———. 2005. Untersuchungen zu ausgewählten Problemen der nominalen Morphologie und der Etymologie der altindogermanischen Sprachen: 1. Die mit Suffix **-on-* gebildeten primären und sekundären Nomina. 2. Lateinisch *mūstella*, *mūstēla* ‚Wiesel; Quappe' und der Wortbildungstyp vedisch *aśvatará-*. 3. Altenglisch *umbor* ‚Kind'. Habilitationsschrift, University of Regensburg.

Sieg, Emil, and Wilhelm Siegling. 1949. *Tocharische Sprachreste: Sprache B* I: *Die Udānālaṅkāra-Fragmente: Text, Übersetzung und Glossar*. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 1953. *Tocharische Sprachreste: Sprache B* II: *Fragmente Nr. 71–633*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Steer, Thomas. 2015. *Amphikinese und Amphigenese: Morphologische und phonologische Untersuchungen zur Genese amphikinetischer Sekundärbildungen und zur internen Derivation im Indogermanischen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Stüber, Karin. 2002. *Die primären* s-*Stämme des Indogermanischen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

TEB = Wolfgang Krause and Werner Thomas. 1960–64. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. 2 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.

TVS = Melanie Malzahn. 2010. *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Leiden: Brill.

Widmer, Paul. 2004. *Das Korn des weiten Feldes: Interne Derivation, Derivationskette und Flexionsklassenhierarchie. Aspekte der nominalen Wortbildung im Urindogermanischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen.

Winter, Werner. 1987. Toch. B *ñakte*, A *ñkät* 'god': Two Nouns, Their Derivatives, Their Etymology. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 15(3–4).297–325.

———. 1989. Tocharian B *-aiñ* : B *-añ*/*-āñ* and Related Problems. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 3.111–20.