

Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft

Im Auftrage
des Münchener Sprachwissenschaftlichen
Studienkreises

herausgegeben von
Daniel Kölligan, Norbert Oettinger und Stefan Schaffner



Heft 76/1 – 2024 [2025]
J.H. Röll

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie;
detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über:
<http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar

© 2025 Verlag J.H. Röll GmbH, Dettelbach

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Vervielfältigungen aller Art,
auch auszugsweise, bedürfen der Zustimmung des Verlages.
Gedruckt auf chlorfreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier.
Gesamtherstellung: Verlag J.H. Röll GmbH

Printed in Germany
ISSN 0077-1910

Inhalt

GIULIO IMBERCIADORI

Rereading the Tocharian Reed: On B *karwa/o**,

A **kru* and the PIE root **kreu_h_{2/3}*- ‘be(come) hollow’ 7

SERGIO NERI

Alb. *burrë* ‚(Ehe-)Mann‘: Ein etymologischer Versuch 39

NORBERT OETTINGER

Zu Form und Funktion des “*u*-Präsens”

im Anatolischen und Indogermanischen 97

MARTIN SCHWARTZ

√**ksen-*, **ksenu-*, √**ksn(e)u-*, √*xšn(a)u-*:

Indo-European Reciprocity and its Gathic Iconicity 111

Rereading the Tocharian Reed: On B *karwa/o**, A **kru* and the PIE root **kreu_{h2/3}-* ‘be(come) hollow’*

Abstract: This article presents a synchronic and diachronic analysis of the Tocharian words for ‘reed’. I argue that their nom.sg. should be reconstructed as B *karwa/o**, A **kru* (nominal class VI.3b) and their synchronic semantics should be specified as ‘a reed’ (count meaning) ~ ‘reed wood / reed material’ (mass meaning). In addition, I trace back B *karwa/o**, A **kru* to a newly identified root PIE **kreu_{h2/3}-*, whose original semantics ‘be(come) hollow’ is directly witnessed by the Celtic continuants OIr. *cró* ‘socket; eye (of needle)’, W *crau* ‘hole; eye (of needle)’, etc. Finally, also PGerm. **χreu_{h2/3}-* ‘reed’ is claimed to belong to the present root PIE **kreu_{h2/3}-*.

Keywords: Indo-European; Tocharian; Caland system; nominal morphology.

The aim of the present contribution is to shed light on the synchronic and diachronic background of the Tocharian lexemes for ‘reed’. Although these words represent well known items of the Tocharian lexicon, no general consensus on their inflection and etymology has been reached thus far.

The paper is structured as follows: (i) section § 1 provides an overview of the attestations of the Tocharian words for ‘reed’, with the goal of establishing their inflectional class and stem shape; (ii) section § 2 critically reviews previous etymological proposals; (iii) section § 3 advances a new etymological proposal; (iv) section § 4 summarizes the main achievements of the paper.

* Thanks go to Guido Borghi, Olav Hackstein, Sergio Neri, Norbert Oettinger, Alessandro Parenti, and Anthony Yates for their valuable comments on earlier drafts of this paper. The responsibility for all remaining errors is mine alone.

§ 1. Attestations and semantics

§ 1.1. Tocharian B

§ 1.1.1. Gen.pl. B *kärwāmts** ‘of the reeds’

For the Tocharian B ‘reed’ word only the genitive plural is directly attested. The most secure occurrence is in the poetical text B255a4MQ (archaic), where one finds the sandhi variant B *kärwa*= standing for the expected gen.pl. B *kärwāmts** (= /kärwāntsä/*): cf. B255a3-a4 [8a] *ket šāñ skwänma ma takam sū a4 alyekmeṃ yaskāstrā* [8b] *yaṣu skwänma ket {r/p}älsko kärwa=skwänmā ma skwänma* : [8c] *koṣko rāsām taršītse tsätko tsätkwaṃ enkāstrā*. The interpretation of this passage is notoriously difficult (Pinault 2002: 146).

While Schmidt (1974: 90, 85, 149, 241) does not translate the relevant pāda 8b where B *kärwa*= occurs, Adams proposes two different interpretations of this passage: (i) “[8a] whoever does not have his own fortune [plural in Tocharian], he begs from another. [8b] Begging [is] fortune; to whom is the thought, ‘the fortune of reeds [reeds metonymic for beggars’ canes] [is] not a fortune’, [8c] he [= the one who had the thought] spreads/covers the *koṣko*; he grasps the error of deception [lege: *taršī[n]tse*] erroneously” – thus Adams (2006: 398–399); (ii) starting from *ket [p]älsko* (pāda 8b): “[8b] to whom [is] the thought, “the fortunes of reeds [reeds metonymic for beggars’ canes] [are] not fortunes; [8c] the hut protects deceptively”; he grasps [= who had the thought] the error erroneously” – thus Adams (2013: 220 *s.v.* *koṣko*, with question mark).

Most recently, Bernard & Chen (2022: 13) offered the following translation: “Who does not have his own pleasures, [and] to whom the thought [occurs]: ‘alms are pleasures’, he begs from another. [Yet] the pleasures of reeds (i.e., this-worldly pleasures) are not pleasures. Like a [charcoal-]pit, the deceptive (i.e., craving) leads [him]. [It is] erroneous (*viparīta* or *viparyasta*): [he] takes it erroneously (i.e., he takes what is painful as pleasurable)”.

Although the whole passage remains partially obscure, Bernard & Chen’s interpretation of the syntagma B *kärwa*=*skwänmā* (B255a4) as

‘fortunes [i.e., pleasures] of the reeds [i.e., of this world]’ is most convincing – cf. also the discussion by Bernard & Chen (2022: 10). Despite the fragmentary context, a form B *(k̄a)rw(a)ts* can be restored in the quasi-parallel text B254a2MQ (archaic): it confirms the above assumption of a gen.pl. B *k̄arwāmts** ‘of the reeds’ – cf. Sieg & Siegling 1953: 154 fn. 9, 156 fn. 3; Adams 2006: 399 fn. 23; 2013: 153.

§ 1.1.2. Adjective B *k̄arwā-ṣṣe** ‘pertaining to a (single) reed’

The existence of an adjective B *k̄arwā-ṣṣe** is secured by the obl.sg.f. B *k̄arwāṣṣai* attested in B88a1Š (classic; Araṇemijātaka). This passage describes the cruel Brahmin Durmukhe beating the little prince Uttara with the root of a reed (perl.sg. B *k̄arwāṣṣai witsakai-sa*): cf. B88a1 *tumem durmukhe brāhmaṇe uttare«m» śamaśkem k̄arwāṣṣai witsakaisa rāskare tsopam-ne* ‘darauf schlug der Brahmane Durmukha ihn, den Knaben Uttara, heftig mit einer Rohrwurzel’ (after Thomas 1957: 91,¹ with translation of the verbal root B *tsop-* as ‘beat’ rather than ‘sting’ according to Huard 2022: 382).

As is well known, Tocharian adjectives in B *-ṣṣe*, A *-ṣi* can be derived from a noun’s singular or plural oblique stem, in such a way that the singularity or plurality of the noun is reflected in the meaning of the adjective – cf., e.g., B obl.sg. *camel* ‘birth’ → adjective *cmel-ṣe* ‘pertaining to a (single) birth’ vs. obl.pl. *cmela* ‘births’ → adjective *cmela-ṣṣe* ‘pertaining to (many) births’ (TEB 1, 145). Now, since the interpretation of the syntagm B *k̄arwāṣṣai witsakai-sa* as ‘with a root pertaining to (many) reeds’ is non-sensical, the adjective B *k̄arwā-ṣṣe** means ‘pertaining to a (single) reed’ and thus points to an unattested obl.sg. (not plural) B *karwa** (= /k̄arwa/*) ‘a reed’. According to the classification in TEB 1, 118–144, an oblique singular in B /-a/ can only belong to a substantive of the class VI.3b – cf. TEB 1, 135–136, to be integrated with Pinault 2008: 486–487 and Malzahn 2011: 83–88. For the nominal class VI.3b, two subtypes are known: (i) VI.3b^a, e.g. B sg. nom. *kantwo* / obl. *kantwa* ~ pl. nom. *kāntwān** /

1 Cf. also Pinault 2004: 259.

obl. *kantwaṃ*² m. ‘tongue’ (: A sg. nom./obl. *käntu* m. ‘id.’); (ii) VI.3b^β, e.g. B sg. nom. *maiyya* (~ *maiyyo*)³ / obl. *maiyya* ~ pl. nom. *maiyyāñ** / obl. *maiyyaṃ*⁴ f. ‘power’ – for an example with an equivalent in Tocharian A, cf. nom./obl.sg. B *yasa* (gender unknown) : A *wäs* m. or a. ‘gold’.

Accordingly, beside the obl.sg. B *karwa** ‘reed’ one should expect either an unattested nom.sg. B *karwo** (VI.3b^α) or B *karwa** (VI.3b^β).

§ 1.1.3. Adjective B *kärwā-ṣṣe** ‘(made) of reed wood / material’

Beside B88a1 (§ 1.1.2 above), two further attestations for an adjective of the shape B *kärwā-ṣṣe** are known. In both cases the obl.sg.m. B *kärwāṣṣe* appears in the syntagm B *kärwāṣṣe ost*, which translates the Sanskrit determinative compound *naḍāgāra-* ‘reed house’ – cf. Skt. *nāḍa-* ‘reed, stalk’ (MW: 534.2; *SWTF* 3, 14) and *āgāra-* ‘apartment, dwelling’ (MW: 130.1).⁵

The two relevant passages are: (i) PKNS37b4DA (classic; Mahāprabhāsavadāna; bilingual) *naḍāgāra iva kuṃja(ra) (kā)rwāṣṣe ost ram no oñkolmo* “*naḍāgāra iva kuṃjara* but as the elephant [destroys] a reed house”;⁶ (ii) PKNS83a1 (archaic; Jātaka/Avadāna) *tume(ṃ) br(ā)hm(a)ṇe kā(r)wāṣṣe ost tke(ṃ)sa śāmā(śkaṃ) (we)sāñ sp(e) k(o)šk(ai)ne šeśc(a)n(mor)m(eṃ) en(e)pr(e) (ceṃ) mcuške(ntsä) ///* “thereupon, the brahmin after having set up a reed house on the earth for us little boy(s) close to a pit (?), in front of (the) prince(s)

2 Attested as B *kaṃtwaṃ* in THT1363.e b4 (Huard 2022: 492).

3 On the secondary nature of the nom.sg.-variant B *maiyyo*, see Peyrot 2008: 99–100.

4 Attested in the classical manuscript B621b3 (Del Tomba 2023: 141). Cf. also B *-maiyyaṇ* (e.g., IOL Toch 36b1 classic) and B *-maiyyaṃ* (e.g., B211a2MQ archaic-classic), used as second members of possessive compounds.

5 On the use of Tocharian adjectives in B *-ṣṣe*, A *-ṣi* for translating the first member of Sanskrit determinative compounds, see Thomas 1973: 172–174; Pinault 2008: 302; 2016: 244–245; Meunier 2015, especially 141–145.

6 Cf. *CEToM* (PKNS37), with translation of B *(kā)rwāṣṣe ost* as “house made of reeds”. For the first edition of the manuscript PKNS37 and useful comments on the quoted line, see Pinault 1988: 194, 199–200.

...”.⁷ In the preceding translation, B *sp(e)* has been understood as a preposition governing the locative B *k(o)šk(ai)-ne* ‘in / to a pit’ (?), and the syntagm B *šāmā(škam)* (*we*)*sāñ* ‘for us little boys’ – a genitive with dative semantics – as showing *Gruppenflexion* in its first member obl.pl. B *šāmā(škam)*.

For the interpretation of the syntagm B *kärwāšše ost* = Skt. *naḍāgāra* – the following three possibilities are available.

(i) Since a house cannot be made of single reed, B *kärwā-šše** might exhibit a plural semantics ‘(made) of reeds’. Consequently, one should assume an underlying obl.pl. B *karwa**, which could only belong to the nominal class I.2 – type B sg. nom./obl. *ost* ~ pl. nom./obl. *ost(u)wa* a. ‘house’ (*TEB* 1, 119, 138; Pinault 2008: 492–493). Adams (2013:153) takes an approach along these lines, positing a lexical entry B “*karwa** (n[oun].pl[ural].) ‘reeds’” and glossing the adjective B *kärwāšše** as ‘pertaining to reeds’ – cf. also *DTTA*: 125, “B pl. *karwa**, *kärwā**”.⁸

However, this analysis is incompatible with the attestation of the obl.sg.f. B *kärwāššai*, which in B88a1 indisputably means ‘pertaining to a (single) reed’ (§ 1.1.2 above). Were B *kärwā-šše** in PKNS37b4 and PKNS83a1 really based on an obl.pl. B *karwa** ‘reeds’, then one would expect an obl.sg. B **kar*: the latter, though, would have led to the derivation of a secondary adjective B **kr-ašše* (= **/kär-āšše/*) rather than to that of the attested adjective B *kärwā-šše** (obl.sg.f. *kärwā-ššai*) – cf. B obl.pl. *ost-(u)wa* ‘houses’ → adjective **ostwā-šše* ‘pertaining to houses’ (: A *waštwā-ši** ‘id.’ in YQ N.1b7) vs. obl.sg. *ost* ‘house’ → adjective *ost-ašše** ‘pertaining to a (single) house’ (e.g., obl.sg.m. in B50b2Š classic [~ A *wašt-aši** ‘id.’ in A360a12]).

7 Cf. *CEToM* (PKNS83), with translation of B *kä(r)wāšše ost* as “house of reeds” and restoration of an otherwise unattested *sp(ä)* – instead of *sp(e)* (see the main text above) – at line a1. The passage at hand (PKNS83a1) is not dealt with by Bernard & Chen (2022), who propose a new translation ‘pit, hole’ instead of traditional ‘hut’ for B *koško*.

8 In this respect, the translation ‘Rohr-’ by Krause & Thomas (*TEB* 2, 182) is ambiguous, since it is not clear whether the underlying semantics should be understood as ‘zu (einem) Rohr gehörig’ or ‘zu (mehreren) Röhren gehörig’.

(ii) If one maintains that B *kärwā-ṣṣe** in PKNS37b4 and PKNS83a1 means ‘(made) of reeds’, (s)he might alternatively assume that this adjective is based on an obl.pl. B *karwaṃ** (= /kārwan/*), regularly belonging to the nominal class VI.3b^a or VI.3b^b (§ 1.1.2 above).

Admittedly, this scenario would present a formal difficulty, since from a putative obl.pl. B *karwaṃ** one would expect an adjective B **kärwām-ṣṣe* rather than B *kärwā-ṣṣe**: cf. obl.pl. B *yälloṃ* ‘sense functions’ (~ nom.pl. B *yälloñ*) → adjective B *yälloṃ-ṣṣe** ‘pertaining to the sense functions’ (B213a1MQ archaic-classic, PKAS6Ia6DA classic) and see *TEB* 1, 145; Adams 2013: 540–541. However, the adjective B *yälloṃ-ṣṣe** also exhibits a simplified variant B *yällo-ṣṣe** in PKAS5Ba4 (classic). Accordingly, one might argue that both attested forms B *kärwāṣṣe* in PKNS37b4 and PKNS83a1 represent simplified variants of a regular adjective B **kärwām-ṣṣe*. Neither of these manuscripts, though, supplies direct parallels for the relevant simplification B *-VmṣṣV-* > *-VṣṣV-*.

(iii) A further alternative would be to reckon with a mass meaning ‘(made) of reed wood / material’: in this case, B *kärwā-ṣṣe** would point to an obl.sg. B *karwa** (~ nom.sg. B *karwo/a**) and thus confirm its appurtenance to the nominal class VI.3b^a or VI.3b^b (§ 1.1.2 above). Regarding the semantics, one should assume that the underlying substantive B *karwo/a** exhibited not only a count reading ‘a reed’, but also a mass reading ‘reed wood / reed material’ – cf. PDE *reed* in *reed house*. From Tocharian one might compare the syntagm B *ayāṣṣe kemeṣṣe sucīkar* ‘a needle-case of bone [or] tooth [i.e., ivory]’ in IOL Toch 246b4 (see Adams 2013: 49), whereby the adjective B *keme-ṣṣe* is morphologically based on the count singular B *keme* ‘tooth’ but actually displays a mass meaning ‘(made) of tooth material’.

As it seems the most economical, the latter scenario in (iii) above will be adopted in the following.

§ 1.2. Tocharian A

§ 1.2.1. Loc.sg. A *kärw-am* (?)

Although older reference works (*TG*: 47, 141; *TLT*: 92; *DTA*: 218) register a loc.sg. form A *kärw-am* – which would point to a nom.sg. A *kru** ‘reed’ –, this cannot be regarded as certain for the following reasons.

First, the sequence *kärwam* in A12a5 (Punyavantajātaka) ought to be left aside from the present discussion, since in this passage one should rather read *kärwamsam* and interpret it as the locative plural of a substantive A *kärwam** ‘rock’ – cf. Schmidt 1974: 466 with fn. 7; Hilmarsson 1996: 98; Winter 1997: 168–169; Itkin 2011: 250; *DTTA*: 125.

Second, the sequence *kärwam* /// in THT2457a4 remains unclear. Whereas Carling et al. (*DTA*: 218) interpret it as a locative singular ‘in the reed’ and Adams (2013: 153) as a locative plural ‘in the reeds’, one cannot exclude – due to the fragmentary context – that a plural form of the substantive A *kärwam** ‘rock’ should be restored for the present case as well (thus Itkin 2011: 250, see also *DTTA*: 125).

Finally, Malyshev (2019: 89 fn. 17) mentions a Tocharian A form *kärwam* and assigns it to the unpublished manuscript A456a b2. However, since no attestation context is given, the meaning of this form remains obscure.

Despite all these uncertainties, the assumption of a nom.sg.-form A **kru* (< **käru* < **kärw* < **kärwa/ā*) is most likely, since the latter represents the expected equivalent of a nom.sg. B *karwo/a** (§ 1.1.2 above) – cf. the pairs A *käntu* (< **käntw* < **käntwa*) : B *kantwo* ‘tongue’ and A *wäs* (< **wäsā*) : B *yasa* ‘gold’.

§ 1.2.2. Adjective A *kärwā-ši** ‘(made) of reed wood / material’

An obl.sg.m. A *kärwāši* is attested in the parallel texts A258a4 = A354b6 (Maitreyasamitinātaka; = *Udānavarga* IV.37c/d). There, A *kärwāši* occurs in the syntagm A *kärwāši wašt* (= Skt. *naḍāgāra*-‘reed house’), which thus perfectly matches B *kärwāšše ost* – cf. *TG*:

26; *TLT*: 69; *TEB* 2, 98; *DTTA*: 125, and § 1.1.3 above. The relevant passages are: (i) A258a4 (*ptäpsäs*) (*wla*)*lunešim ratäk • kār wāši wašt oki oṅkalām* “(shake off) the army of death, like an elephant [shakes] a bamboo hut!” (*CEToM* [A258]); (ii) A354b5-b6 *ptäpsäs wlalune- b6 -(šim) (ratäk) (•) (kār w)āši wašt mā«nt» ne oṅkalām* – same translation, cf. Schmidt 1989: 77, 79.

Morphologically, A *kār wā-ši** allows several interpretations. However, economy grounds suggest that this form should be analyzed in the same way as its inner-Tocharian equivalent B *kār wā-šše**. Since the latter has been shown to be based on an underlying obl.sg. B *karwa** (= /kārwa/*), A *kār wā-ši** will also point to an underlying obl.sg. A **kār wā* ‘reed’, belonging to the nominal class VI.3b^a or VI.3b^b – cf. A obl.sg. **kāntwā* ‘tongue’ (> *kāntu* ‘id.’) → adjective -*kāntwā-ši* ‘pertaining to the tongue’ (e.g., A236b6) and A obl.sg. **wāsā* ‘gold’ (> *wās* ‘id.’) → adjective *wsā-ši* ‘golden’ (e.g., A22a4).

In turn, this implies the following assumptions: (i) for Tocharian A, a singular paradigm nom. **kārwa/ā* / obl. **kār wā* > **kār w* / **kār w* > **kār u* / **kār u* > **kru* / **kru* ‘reed’ – belonging to the nominal class VI.3b^a or VI.3b^b – should be reconstructed; (ii) the syntagm A *kār wā-ši wašt* ought to be glossed as ‘house (made) of reed (wood / material), reed house’, thus requiring a twofold semantics ‘a reed’ (count reading) ~ ‘reed wood / reed material’ (mass reading) for the underlying substantive A **kru*.

§ 1.3. Local summary

As for their morphology, the Tocharian words for ‘reed’ belong to the nominal class VI.3b^a or VI.3b^b – i.e., type B *kantwo*, A *kāntu* ‘tongue’ or B *maiyya* ‘power’, respectively. Consequently, the following paradigms can be reconstructed: (i) B sg. nom. *karwo/a** / obl. *karwa** (→ adjective *kār wā-šše**) ~ pl. nom. *kār wāñ** / gen. *kār wāmts**⁹ / obl. *karwañ**; (ii) A sg. nom. **kru* / obl. **kru* (~ ? loc.sg. *kār w-añ*; → adjective *kār wā-ši**) – a plural paradigm A nom. **kār wāñ* / obl.

9 Attested as B *kārwa*= and B (*kā*)*rw(a)ts* in the archaic MQ-texts B255a4 and B254a2, respectively (§ 1.1.1 above).

kärwās* (cf. A *käntwāñ / *käntwās**)¹⁰ is likely, but cannot be directly proved.

As for their semantics, these items exhibited both a count meaning ‘a reed’ and a mass meaning ‘reed wood / reed material’. The former semantics occur in the syntagms B *kärwāmts skwanma** ‘fortunes [i.e., pleasures] of the reeds [i.e., of this world]’ (B255a4MQ archaic, B254a2MQ archaic) and B *kärwāššai witsakai-sa* ‘with the root of a reed’ (B88a1Š classic). The latter semantics show up in the syntagm B *kärwāšše ost*, A *kärwāši wašt* = Skt. *naḍāgāra-* (PKNS37b4DA classic, PKNS83a1 archaic; A258a4 = A354b6), which should thus be translated as ‘house (made) of reed (wood / material), reed house’ rather than as ‘house (made) of reeds’.

§ 2. Previous etymological proposals¹¹

§ 2.1. The *krūvā* connection

Van Windekens (1976: 236–237; 1979: 136) relates the Tocharian lexemes for ‘reed’ to the word family of OCS *krovŭ* m. ‘roof’, Lith. *kráuti* ‘accumulate’ and – particularly – Lith. *krūvā* f. (4) ‘heap, pile’, which belongs to an underlying root PIE **kreuH-* ‘to layer, cover’ (LIV: 371; EDSIL: 250, 254; ALEW: 601–602, 614). However, the original semantics postulated by Van Windekens – i.e., ‘ce qui couvre (sert à couvrir), ce qui enveloppe, ce qui cache’ – cannot have led to the attested Tocharian meaning ‘reed’. Cf. also the criticism by Adams (2013: 153).

§ 2.2. The *harundō* connection

De Vaan (EDLIL: 279) tentatively connects B *karwo/a**, A **kru* ‘reed’ with the Latin synonym (*h*)*arundō*, *-inis* f. (Plaut.). However, he ends up rejecting this hypothesis and rather accepting Driessen’s proposal (p.c.) of equating Lat. (*h*)*arundō* ‘reed’ with Gaulish **garunda-* ‘shallow water-course’, which seems more likely.

10 Attested is only the instr.pl. A *käntwās-yo* in A356b2 (DTTA: 121).

11 Cf. Thomas 1985: 138.

§ 2.3. The *reed* connection

Concerning the etymology of PGerm. **χreūda-* n. ‘reed’ (> OE *hrēod* n. ‘id.’, OS *hriod* n. ‘id.’, OHG *hriot* n. ‘id.’, etc.), one finds in *EWAh* 7, 538 the following account: “Ein in früheren Etymologika öfter angeführter und aufgrund der Bed[eutung]. naheliegender Zusammenhang mit toch. A *kru** [...] ‚Schilfgras, Bambus‘, toch. B *karwa** [...] ‚Rohr‘ wird in moderner Literatur nicht mehr erwähnt”. However, this “naheliegender Zusammenhang” is no further investigated. In addition, it is remarkable that PGerm. **χreūda-* n. ‘reed’ lacks a convincing etymology, since the traditional account – i.e., the connection with the Lithuanian verb *krutėti* ‘move’ and the interpretation as ‘trembling plant’ – is explicitly rejected by Bichlmeier (*EWAh* 7, 537–538 with reference to *ALEW*: 612–613 s.v. *krutėti*) and deemed “uncertain” by Kroonen (*EDPG*: 246). I will come back to PGerm. **χreūda-* n. ‘reed’ in § 3.3 below.

§ 2.4. The *grava* connection – part 1

Without reconstructing the nominative singular of the Tocharian words for ‘reed’, Isebaert (1980: 209) traces them back to PIE **g^hruyā* or **g^hreyā* and compares particularly YAv. *grava-* ‘reed, stock’ (Bartholomae 1904: 531). He is followed by Adams (2013: 153), who interprets B **karwa**, A **kru-* as plural forms (§ 1.1.3(i) above) and reconstructs their common ancestor as Pre-PToch. **g^(w)rewo-* – cf. also *EWAh* 7, 538.

However, a putative preform Pre-PToch. **g^(w)reyeh₂-* is formally problematic, since it would have yielded PToch. **kr^jāwā* > (liquid metathesis [Ringe 1996: 158–160]) **kār^jwā* > B **/kāryw^o/*, A **kāryw^o* rather than B **/kār^wo/*, A *kār^wo*. Similar difficulties affect a thematic pre-form Pre-PToch. **g^(w)reyo-*, which, moreover, would be expected to join the nominal class V.1 rather than the nominal class VI.3b in Tocharian B – cf. B *yakwe* ‘horse’ < PIE **h₁ék^{yo}-* ‘id.’ and see *TEB* 1,

128–130. Consequently, B *karwo/a**, A **kru* ‘reed’ cannot be directly equated with YAv. *grava-* ‘reed, stock’.¹²

§ 2.5. The *grava* connection – part 2

While modifying his previous analysis (§ 2.6 below), Hilmarsson (1993: 180; 1996: 98) accepts Isebaert’s etymological connection of B *karwo/a**, A **kru* ‘reed’ with YAv. *grava-* ‘id.’. Whereas Hilmarsson (1993: 180) is more cautious (“nom.sg. **kärwā/ā**”), Hilmarsson (1996: 98) assigns the Tocharian words for ‘reed’ to the nominal class VI.3b^a (type B *kantwo*, A *kāntu* ‘tongue’) and reconstructs the paradigms B sg. nom. *karwo** / obl. *karwa**, A sg. nom./obl. **kru* < PToch. **kärwā* / **kärwa*. The Proto-Tocharian forms are traced back to “IE [nom.sg.] **g^(u)reṽ-eH₂* (if this was the genuine normal grade) or zero grade **g^(u)ruṽ-eH₂* (with Lindeman’s variant?), acc.sg. **g^(u)reṽ-H₂-ṁ*/**g^(u)ruṽ-H₂-ṁ*”, while “the Avestan word [i.e., *grava-* ‘reed, stock’] could be a vṛddhi derivative to the zero grade” (Hilmarsson 1996: 98).

Such a scenario is possible and, specifically, one might refine it through the following assumptions. (i) The underlying root would be PIE **g^wer-* ‘be(come) sharp’, which can be independently reconstructed on the basis of the acrostatic (AS) *u*-stem PIE **g^wór-u* / **g^wér-u-* ‘sharpness; sharp object’ > Lat. *verū*, *-ūs* n. ‘spit, spear’ (with secondary long *-ū*), Umb. acc.pl.n. *berva* ‘spits’, and OIr. *bir* n. ‘spit’.¹³ (ii) The Tocharian and Avestan words for ‘reed’ would have originally meant ‘sharpness / sharp (object)’ – cf. Ved. *tējana-* n.

12 Nevertheless, Hamp (1991: 136) tentatively connects both the Tocharian and Avestan words for ‘reed’ with the substantive Lat. *grāmen*, *-inis* n. ‘pasturage’. However, since Lat. *grāmen* can be satisfactorily explained otherwise (cf. *EDLIL*: 269–270), it should be left aside from the present discussion.

13 On these forms, see *IEW*: 479; Neri 2003: 251–252; *EDLIL*: 668; *EDPC*: 62; Weiss 2020: 87, 271. For a different interpretation, see Büthe-Scheider & Kölligan 2018: 20–21, who rather connect Lat *verū* and cognates with the PIE root **g^wreh₂-* ‘be(come) heavy’.

‘reed’ ← *tej-* ‘sharpen’ (*EWAia* 1, 669). (iii) A derivational chain like that in (1) should be assumed.¹⁴

(1) Possible derivation of B *karwo**, A **kru* ‘reed’

AS *u*-stem **g^wór-u* / **g^wér-u-* / loc.sg. **g^wr-éu* ‘sharpness; sharp object’ > Lat. *verū* n. ‘spit, spear’, Umb. acc.pl.n. *berva* ‘spits’, OIr. *bir* n. ‘spit’;

→ delocalival *o*-hypostasis¹⁵ **g^wr-eu-o-* ‘being in sharpness, sharp’ → (substantivization) YAv. *grava-* ‘reed’;¹⁶

→ PK *u*-adjective **g^wér-u-* / **g^wr-éu-* ‘sharp’;

→ PK *h*₂-abstract **g^wér-u-h₂-* / **g^wr-éu-h₂-* ‘sharpness’;

→ HK individualization Pre-PToch. sg. nom. **g^wr-éu-h₂-s* / acc. **g^wr-éu-h₂-m* / gen. **g^wr-u-h₂-és* ‘sharp object’ >> (cf. Del Tomba 2023: 121–122) sg. nom. **g^wr-éu-h₂-s* / acc. **g^wr-u-h₂-és* > **k^wruās* / **k^wru’as* > **k^wruā* / **k^wrua* > PToch. sg. nom. **k^wärwā* / obl. **k^wärwa* > (w-dissimilation)¹⁷ **kärwā* / **kärwa* ‘reed’ > (i) B *karwo** / *karwa** ‘id.’, (ii) A **kärwa* / **kärwā* > **kärw* / **kärw* > **kärü* / **kärü* > **kru* / **kru* ‘id.’.

However, such an explanation of the Tocharian items at hand remains purely hypothetical, since both intermediate pre-forms **g^wér-u-* /

14 Cf. Harðarson’s (2018: 255–256) derivation of the PIE words for ‘fish’ and ‘tongue’.

15 Or, in alternative, *vṛddhi*-derivative with “wrong” full grade II, i.e., **g^wrey-ó-*. On the arising of “wrong” full grades in derivational processes, cf., e.g., PIE **h₁reg^w-* ‘be(come) dark’ → adjective **h₁g^w-s-nó-* ‘dark’ → substantive **h₁órg^w-s-neh₂-* f. ‘darkness’ > Gk. ὀφρῶν f. ‘id.’ and see, among others, Nikolaev 2012–2013: 201 fn. 72; Höfler 2017: 141–143, 468–469.

16 Thus correcting Imberciadori (2022: 91 fn. 13 with references), where YAv. *grava-* ‘reed’ is separated from the PIE root **g^wer-* ‘be(come) sharp’.

17 For a parallel dissimilation PToch. **k^w...w* > **k...w*, cf. Pre-PToch. **g^wr-h₂-u-on-°* > PToch. **k^wärwæn’æ* > **kärwæn’æ* > B *kärweñe*, A *kärwam** ‘rock’ – see Hilmarsson 1993: 180; Kim 1999: 151 fn. 26; Pinault 2008: 425.

*g^wr-éu- ‘sharp’ and *g^wér-u-h₂- / *g^wr̥-ü-éh₂- ‘sharpness’ are otherwise unattested. Thus, a scenario like that under (1) above should be accepted only if no more compelling explanation of B *karwo/a**, A **kru* ‘reed’ suggests itself.

§ 2.6. The *crūs* connection

Under the assumption of a preform Pre-PToch. “**kruyōn*”, Čop (1966–1968: 167–169) first proposed to connect the Tocharian ‘reed’ words with Lat. *crūs*, -*ris* n. ‘shinbone, shank; (lower) leg’ (Plaut.) and Armenian *srun-k^c* pl. ‘id.’. However, a preform “**kruyōn*” can hardly be correct, since an inherited *n*-stem with the semantic feature [-human] would be expected to join the nominal class VI.2 rather than VI.3b in Tocharian – cf. the famous case of B sg. nom. *okso* / obl. *oksai* ‘ox’ < Pre-PToch. *(*h*₂)*uK(-)s-on*¹⁸ and see further Hilmarsson 1987: 44 with fn. 15; Del Tomba 2023: 148, 150–151.

Čop’s proposal has been taken up by Hilmarsson (1986: 162–163), who formally equates B *karwo/a**, A **kru* with Latin *crūs* and assumes that “[a]n I.-E. **kruHs* “hollow stilk [sic] / bone” (> Lat. *crūs*) would yield CT **krwā(s)* [sic] > **kār wā* > A **kru* regularly. The stage **kār wā* is seen in the adj. A *kār wāši*, B *kār wāšše*” (p. 163).

This etymological path has not yet been fully investigated. I will argue that it provides the most compelling account of the Tocharian ‘reed’ words.

18 Which can be further specified as *(*h*₂)*uks-on-* (traditional view – e.g., Pinault 2008: 432–433) or as **h*₂*ug-s-on-* (thus Höfler 2017: 6–40). For a different analysis, see Jasanoff 2018, especially 75–77, who sets up an *oi*-stem.

§ 3. Building on the *crūs* and *reed* connections

§ 3.1. Latin, Armenian, and Tocharian

§ 3.1.1. Semantic analysis

From a semantic point of view, the etymological connection between lexemes meaning ‘shinbone, shank’ (Lat. *crūs*, Arm. *srun-k^c*) and ‘reed’ (B *karwo/a**, A **kru*) is plausible, since it is supported – as Čop (1966–1968: 169) had already noted – by several parallels: cf. (i) Lith. *káulas* m. (1, 3) ‘bone’ ~ Gk. *καυλός* ‘stalk (of a plant); stem’ ~ Lat. *caulis* m. ‘stem, stalk’ (*EDLIL*: 100; *EDG*: 658–659; *ALEW*: 540–541); (ii) Lith. *aũlas* m. ‘leg of tall boot’ ~ OPr. *aulis* m. ‘shinbone’ ~ Gk. *αὐλός* m. ‘hollow tube, pipe’ ~ Hitt. *auli-* c. ‘windpipe, carotid’? (*EDHIL*: 229–230; *EDG*: 170; *ALEW*: 72); (iii) Ru. *cévka* ‘bobbin, spool, (especially hollow) bone, (dial.) shinbone’ ~ Cz. *céva* ‘vein’, OCz. *cěva* ‘tube, spool’ ~ USrb. *cywa* ‘spool; reed’ (*EDSIL*: 76); (iv) Lat. *tībia* f. ‘reed-pipe’ ~ ‘shinbone’ (*EDLIL*: 619); (v) ON *leggǫr* ‘hollow bone; leg’ ~ ‘stalk’ (Baetke 1976: 370; *EDPG*: 321); (vi) PDE *shank* ‘shinbone’ ~ ‘stem, stalk’ (*OED* s.v. *shank*), etc. – see particularly Martirosyan (*EDAIL*: 804).

§ 3.1.2. Morphological analysis – part 1

From a morphological point of view, both Čop (1966–1968: 168–169) and Hilmarsson (1986: 162–163) propose to reconstruct a root noun PIE **kruH-*.

However, tracing back Lat. *crūs*, *-ris* n. – a synchronic *r*-stem continuing an old *s*-stem – to a PIE root noun **kruH-* is problematic:¹⁹ examples like *sū-s*, *su-is* m./f. ‘pig, saw’ (Plaut.) and *grū-s*, *gru-is* f. ‘crane’ (Lucil.) show that a putative paradigm **crūs*, **cru-is* (< Pre-PIt. **kruH-s*, **kruH-es*) would have been perfectly warranted in Latin. Moreover, one ought to deem the neuter gender of Lat. *crūs* to be

19 I am grateful to Sergio Neri for the enriching discussion of the Latin material.

secondary – thus, e.g., Čop (1966–1968: 168), who assumes a m. >> n. gender change in analogy to Lat. *femur*, *feminis* n. ‘thigh’.

At the same time, the reconstruction of a common *s*-stem preform PIE **kruH-s-* – which would lead to Lat. *crūs* and B *karwo/a**, A **kru* regularly – is unattractive as well, since a plural inflection in B nom. -*āñ* / obl. -*am* (see § 1.3 above) is not what one would expect for the continuant of an old neuter *s*-stem. Indeed, the two neuter members of the nominal class VI.3b for which plural forms are attested – viz., B sg. nom. *luwo* / obl. *luwa* (: A *lu*) ‘animal’ and B sg. nom. *pilto/a** / obl. *pilta* (: A *pält*) ‘leaf’²⁰ – exhibit plurals in B /-sa/, namely, B *lwā-sa* (~ A *lw-ā*) and B *piltā-sa* (~ A *pält-wā*); cf. Malzahn 2011: 88.

Therefore, the putative equation Lat. *crūs* : B *karwo/a**, A **kru* < **kruH-(s-)* cannot be maintained.

§ 3.1.3. Morphological analysis – part 2

Since the formal development PIt. **-ouVC-* > Lat. *-ūC-* is *lautgesetzlich* (cf. Hackstein 2011: 109–113; Weiss 2020: 134; Nussbaum 2022: 287–288), I propose to trace back Lat. *crūs*, *-ris* n. ‘shinbone’ to an *s*-stem PIE **kréu(H)-o/es-*²¹ > Pre-PIt. **krou̯-o/Vs-*. The development would be as follows: PIE sg. nom. **kréu(H)-os* / gen. **kréu(H)-es-es* n. > PIt. **krou̯-os* / **krou̯-Vs-es* > Lat. **krou̯us* / **krou̯us-es* > **krou̯s* / **krou̯s-es* > **krūs* / **krūs-es* > Lat. *crūs* / *crūr-is* n.

As for B *karwo/a**, A **kru* ‘reed’, they rather require a root noun with nom.sg. Pre-PToch. **kruH-s* > **kruas* > PToch. **kärwa*. Remarkably, such a root noun Pre-PToch. **kruH-* not only ensures the *set*-character of the underlying PIE root, but also implies – due to the arising of a Proto-Tocharian sequence **-wa-* – a root morpheme PIE **kruh*_{2/3-}

20 Which may even continue an old *s*-stem according to Pinault (2008: 206) and Del Tomba (2023: 136–137); differently Malzahn (2011: 101–102).

21 But a zero-graded *s*-stem PIE **krúH-s-* – of the type PIE **júH-s-* > Ved. *yúṣ-* n. ‘soup, broth’, Lat. *iūs*, *-ris* n. ‘id.’ (NIL: 405–406) – would explain the attested paradigm Lat. *crūs*, *-ris* n. as well. On *s*-stems with “pervasive” zero-grade of the root, see most recently Vine 2022.

rather than **kruh₁*.²² This root noun would have developed as follows: Pre-PToch. sg. nom. **kruh_{2/3-s}* / acc. **kruh_{2/3-m}* > **kruas* / **kru'm* > **krua* / **krum*²³ >> (intra-paradigmatic leveling) **krua* / **krua* > PToch. **kärwa* / **kärwa* > (i) B sg. nom. *karwa** (>> *karwo**? [see fn. 25]) / obl. *karwa** ‘reed’, (ii) A sg. nom. **kärwā* / obl. **kärwā* > **kärw* / **kärw* > **käru* / **käru* > **kru* / **kru*. A comparable development characterized the root noun Pre-PToch. sg. nom. **suh_{2/3-s}* / acc. **suh_{2/3-m}* > **suwas* / **su'm* > **suwa* / **sum*²⁴ >> (intra-paradigmatic leveling) **suwa* / **suwa* > PToch. **suwa* / **suwa* > B sg. nom. **suwa* >> *suwo*²⁵ / obl. *suwa* ‘pig’.

If we now turn to the paradigmatic prehistory of the root noun Pre-PToch. **kruh_{2/3-}* – which in all likelihood was animate –, this form can be traced back to the following PIE ancestors: (i) mobile **kréuh_{2/3-}* / **kruh_{2/3-}*, with abstract or agentive semantics; (ii) AS **króuh_{2/3-}* / **kréuh_{2/3-}*, with resultative or agentive semantics.²⁶ In the former case, Pre-PToch. **kruh_{2/3-}* (> B *karwa/o**, A **kru* ‘reed’)

22 On the inner-Tocharian development PIE **-uh_{2/3-}* > PToch. **-wa-* vs. PIE **-uh₁₋* > PToch. **-u-*, see Hackstein 1998.

23 Or, alternatively, Pre-PToch. **krūm*, if the original acc.sg. **kruh_{2/3-m}* had undergone Stang’s Law.

24 Or, alternatively, Pre-PToch. **sūm*, as per the preceding footnote.

25 Since I accept the standard view that Pre-PToch. **-as#* yielded B *-a#* (e.g., Pinault 2008: 206) rather than B *-o#* (thus Malzahn 2011: 94), I interpret the attested nom.sg. B *suwo* ‘pig’ as an inner-Tocharian B substitution of the expected nom.sg. B **suwa* by analogy to the type B nom.sg. *kantwo* ‘tongue’, whose final *-o* (< PToch. **-ā* < **-ā(s)* < **^oeh_{2-s}*) was regular: i.e., B sg. obl. *kantwa* : nom. *kantwo* = obl. *suwa* : nom. X, whereby X = *suwo*. The assumed reshaping B nom.sg. **suwa* >> *suwo* was also favored by the fact that the original nom.sg. B **suwa* would have been identical – and thus ambiguous – with respect to the obl.sg. B *suwa*. Notably, a transitional state is directly attested by the variation between B nom.sg. *maiyya* (primary) and *maiyyo* (secondary) ‘power’, on which see § 1.1.2 above with fn. 3 and references. Finally, the spread of secondary *-o* at the expense of original *-a* in the nom.sg. is known for other Tocharian B nominal classes as well – cf. B *preściya* ~ *preściyo* ‘time’ (class VI.3a^b). See further Hilmarsson 1989: 86–87 with fn. 8; Peyrot 2008: 99–101; Del Tomba 2023: 135–136.

26 Cf. the seminal study by Schindler (1972, especially 36, 38).

might be explained through the generalization of the weak allomorph; in the latter case, one should assume an intermediate paradigm Pre-PToch. **króuh*_{2/3-} / **kruh*_{2/3-},²⁷ then further levelled to **kruh*_{2/3-}. In order to decide between these two options, the external evidence from Celtic and Germanic will be crucial – see § 3.2 and 3.3 below.

Significantly, the assumed coexistence of an *s*-stem **kréuH-o/es-* beside a root-noun **kréuh*_{2/3-} / **kruh*_{2/3-} or **króuh*_{2/3-} / **kréuh*_{2/3-} would be by no means isolated: cf. (i) PIE **h₁réud^h-* / **h₁rud^h-* ‘redness’ (> OIr. *rá* ‘red color; red coloring plant’) ~ **h₁réud^h-o/es-* ‘redness’ (> Gk. *ῥευθος* n. ‘id.’, Lat. *rōbus/r, -oris* n. ‘oak-tree; strength’);²⁸ (ii) PIE **uólek^w-* ‘voice’ (> Ved. *vác-* f. ‘id.’, Lat. *vōx* f. ‘id.’, etc.) ~ **uék^w-o/es-* ‘word, speech’ (> Ved. *vācas-* n. ‘id.’, Gk. *ἔπος* n. ‘id.’);²⁹ (iii) PIE **uēiH-* / **uiH-* ‘strength’ (> Gk. *ἰς* [ἵ] f. ‘id.’, Lat. *vīs* sg.f. ‘id.’) ~ **uēiH-o/es-* ‘strength’ (> Ved. *vāyas-* n. ‘id.’, → Lat. *vīr-es* pl.f. ‘forces’),³⁰ etc.

Finally, Arm. *srun-k^c* pl. ‘shinbone, shank’ < PArm. **sru-ni-* < Pre-PArm. **kruh*_{2/3-(s)-ni-} can be interpreted in several ways.³¹ (i) The suffix **-ni-* could have been added to an inherited basis **kruh*_{2/3-(s)-} due to a contamination with the body part name **kloy-ni-* ‘hip, buttock’ (> Ved. *śróṇi-* f. ‘id.’, Lat. *clūnis* m./f. ‘id.’, etc.). However, this hypothesis is weakened by the fact that PIE **kloy-ni-* is not independently continued in Armenian. (ii) The suffix **-ni-* might have arisen through derivation, particularly through a derivational chain having the *s*-stem **kréuh*_{2/3-o/es-} (> Lat. *crūs* ‘shinbone’) as its starting point: i.e., *s*-stem **kréuh*_{2/3-o/es-} → adjective **kruh*_{2/3-s-nó-} → *i*-stem substantive³² **kruh*_{2/3-s-ni-} > Arm. *srun-k^c* pl. ‘shinbone, shank’. (iii) The suffix **-ni-* might have arisen through derivation, but the starting point of the derivational chain would be **kruh*_{2/3-}, i.e., the

27 On the emergency of accentual mobility in originally AS paradigms, see Schindler 1972: 35–36; Yates 2022.

28 Cf. Stüber 2002: 140–141; NIL: 580–584.

29 Cf. EWAia 2, 491, 539–540; Stüber 2002: 169–170; EDLIL: 692; EDG: 447–448.

30 Cf. EWAia 2, 509; Stüber 2002: 84; EDLIL: 683; Weiss 2020: 274.

31 Cf. Olsen 1999: 79; EDAIL: 585–586 with references.

32 On the derivational process of *i*-substantivization, see, among others, Schindler 1980: 390; Nussbaum 1999: 399–400.

zero grade of the root **kreu_{h2/3}-*: cf. **kruh_{2/3}-* → verbal adjective **kruh_{2/3}-nó-* → *i*-stem substantive **kruh_{2/3}-ni-* > Arm. *srun-k^c* pl. ‘shinbone, shank’.

§ 3.1.4. Interim conclusions

As for the Tocharian ‘reed’ words, the most suitable preform is a root noun with nom.sg. Pre-PToch. **kruh_{2/3}-s*. Its expected outcomes would be nom.sg. B *karwa** (= /kárwa/*), A **kru*, which speak for the appurtenance of the Tocharian ‘reed’ words to the nominal class VI.3b^β (type B sg. nom./obl. *maiyya* ‘power’) rather than VI.3b^α (type B sg. nom. *kantwo* / obl. *kantwa* ‘tongue’). However, an inner-Tocharian B reshaping nom.sg. *karwa** >> *karwo** – parallel to the reshaping B nom.sg. **suwa* >> *suwo* ‘pig’ – cannot be excluded. Based on the obl.sg. B *karwa**, a new plural B nom. *kärwā-ñ** / obl. *karwa-m** was built on the model of other animates like B (nom./)obl.sg. *maiyya* ~ pl. nom. *maiyyā-ñ** / obl. *maiyya-m* ‘power’.

As for a deeper PIE level, the above analysis points to the existence of an underlying root PIE **kreu_{h2/3}-*, whose derivatives developed the semantics ‘shinbone, shank’ ~ ‘reed’. Based on the parallels in § 3.1.1 above, it is most likely that PIE **kreu_{h2/3}-* exhibited an original meaning ‘be(come) hollow’ or similar. Semantically, this would suggest that the root at hand participated in the Caland system.³³

§ 3.2. Celtic

The present section is devoted to the analysis of the following Celtic forms: OIr. *cró* m. (*o*-stem) ‘socket, hoop (of lance); eye (of needle)’, MW *creu* > W *crau* m. ‘hole, socket, aperture, perforation; eye (of needle); helve’, MBret. *craou* m. ‘id.’, Corn. *crow* m. ‘id.’, etc. Beside these forms, one finds the homophonous items OIr. *cró* m. (*o*-stem), MW *creu* > W *crau* m., MBret. *craou* m., and Corn. *crow* m., which exhibit a diverging meaning ‘enclosure, pen; sty, stall, hut; cell, prison’ – cf. *IEW*: 616–617; *LEIA* 3, 240; Zair 2012: 170–171; *GPC s.v. crau*², *crau*³; *eDIL s.v.* 1 *cró*. Formally, the above lexemes can be

33 On which see, among others, Nussbaum 1976; Rau 2009: 67–186.

traced back to Pre-PCelt. **k^(r)reu(H)o-* or **k^(r)ru(H)o-*, as per Zair (2012: 171). Semantically, they allow two possible interpretations.

§ 3.2.1. One single word family

One possibility would be to regard the forms for ‘hole, perforation; eye (of needle); helve’ and those for ‘enclosure; stall, hut; cell’ as stemming from the same diachronic source – thus J. Pinault (1961: 599–606), who assumes an original semantics ‘circular object’; *LEIA* 3, 240–241; and *eDIL* s.v. 1 *cró*, “term of very wide application, the basic meaning being enclosure, enclosed space, fold, pen, *etc.*”.

However, starting from an original semantics ‘circular object’ or ‘enclosed space’, the Celtic forms at hand remain without any convincing etymology – cf. Zair 2012: 171. A putative connection with OIr. *cruind* ‘round’ – thus *LEIA* 3, 240 with references – ought to be rejected on formal grounds, since OIr. *cruind* continues PCelt. **krundi-* (*EDPC*: 221, 227–228). In the same vein, a comparison with the word family of Lat. *curvus* ‘curved, bent’ ~ *cort-īna* ‘rounded pot, cauldron’ and Gk. *κυρτός* ‘curved’ is formally unattractive as well, since the latter forms point to a root PIE **k_uer-*:³⁴ cf. (i) PIE **k_uor-tó-* > (a) PGk. **k_uur-tó-*³⁵ > **kur-tó-* > *κυρ-τός*, (b) (Pre-)Plt. **k^wor-to-* > **kor-to-* > Lat. **cor-to-* → *cort-īna*; (ii) Pre-Plt. **k_ur-_uó-* > (Weiss 2020: 174) **k^wr-_uó-* > Plt. **k^wur-_uo-*³⁶ > **kur-_uo-* > Lat. *cur-vus*.³⁷

34 Thus also *EDLIL*: 138, 158 and *EDG*: 808 against *IEW*: 935–938 (root *3(s)ker-* ‘to turn, bend’).

35 On the formal development (Pre-)PGk. **-C_uoR-* > **-C_uuR-*, see Vine 1999: 578, 582; Zair 2017: 263 fn. 10.

36 On the formal development Pre-Plt. **-r-* > Lat. *-ur-* / *K^w_*, see Leumann 1977: 57; Meiser 1998: 63–64; *EDLIL*: 275 s.v. *gurdus* ‘blockhead, dolt’; and further Driessen 2001: 61–62 with fn. 27 – cautious is Weiss (2020: 104); skeptical Zair (2017: 266–267).

37 The root shape PIE **k_uer-* is also supported by Alb. *kërrús* ‘I bend’, which relies on a base PALb. **kuṛa-* < Pre-PALb. **k_uur-na-* < **k_ur-nó-* – cf. Demiraj 1997: 220; *DPEWA* s.v. By contrast, Mlr. *corr* ‘protruding, pointed, sharp’ and MW *cwrr* m. ‘corner, edge’ ought to be separated on semantic grounds – cf. *EDPC*: 230 *contra* *EDLIL*: 158 with references.

Such a root PIE **k_uer-* is incompatible with the preforms **k^(r)re_u(H)o-* or **k^(r)ru(H)o-* that underlie the Celtic items under discussion.

§ 3.2.2. Two distinct word families

Alternatively, one might surmise that the two Celtic groups for ‘hole, perforation; eye (of needle); helve’ and ‘enclosure; stall, hut; cell’ are to be kept distinct diachronically: thus implicitly *IEW*: 616–617; *EDPC*: 221; Zair 2012: 170–171 (who does not even refer to the semantics ‘hole, perforation; eye (of needle); helve’) and explicitly *GPC*, which distinguishes an entry *crau*² ‘sty, hovel, pigsty; place of defence, stockade’ from an entry *crau*³ ‘hole, helve, socket, eye, aperture, perforation’.³⁸

Under this assumption, the lexemes meaning ‘enclosure; stall, hut; cell’ can be connected with the root PIE **kre_uH-* ‘to layer, cover’, since ‘layer, cover’ would be a plausible *Benennungsmotiv* for some rudimental building or shelter for animals – cf. *IEW*: 616–617 and *LIV*: 371 fn. 1 s.v. **kre_uH-* (“viell.”).³⁹ By contrast, the lexemes meaning ‘hole, perforation; eye (of needle); helve’ might be regarded as continuants of a different PIE root, exhibiting a basic semantics ‘be(come) hollow, empty’ or similar – cf. PIE **ké_uH-* ‘be(come) hollow, empty’ → Gk. κύαρ n. ‘eye of a needle; hole’ (*EDG*: 793; *LSJ*: 1004).

If the latter hypothesis is correct, one might trace back OIr. *cró* m. ‘socket, hoop (of lance); eye (of needle)’, MW *creu* > W *crau* m. ‘hole, socket, aperture, perforation; eye (of needle); helve’, MBret. *craou* m. ‘id.’, Corn. *crow* m. ‘id.’, etc. to a substantive PCelt. **krou-* ‘hollow object, hole, cavity’ < Pre-PCelt. **kré/ó_uh_{2/3}-o-* ‘id.’⁴⁰ ←

38 Although s.v. *crau*³ it is observed “yr un o bosibl o ran tarddiad â *crau*²” (i.e., “possibly the same in origin as *crau*²”).

39 Zair (2012: 170–171) expresses skepticism. To be rejected for formal reasons is Matasović’s (*EDPC*: 221) alternative explanation, starting from Pre-PCelt. **kroh₁-po-* ‘roof’ (~ ON *hróf* ‘boat-shed’, OE *hróf* ‘roof’) – see Zair 2012: 170.

40 Either a barytone (vṛddhi-)substantivization (cf., among others, Nikolaev 2012–2013: 209 with fn. 98; Höfler 2017: 131–133) or an *o*-grade

adjective **k̑r(e)uh_{2/3}-ó-* ‘hollow’. Thus, the Celtic words treated here attest directly to the existence of a PIE root **k̑reuh_{2/3}-* ‘be(come) hollow’, which has been postulated on formal and semantic grounds in § 3.1.4 above.

Morphologically, the adjective Pre-PCelt. **k̑r(e)uh_{2/3}-ó-* ‘hollow’ might be analyzed as a (vr̥ddhi-)derivative of a mobile root noun PIE **k̑reuh_{2/3}-* / **k̑ruh_{2/3}-* ‘hollowness, cavity’. Since such a root noun in turn corresponds to one of the two possible forerunners reconstructed for B *karwa/o**, A **kru* ‘reed’ under § 3.1.3 above, it is tempting to regard the Tocharian items as continuants of the same root noun **k̑reuh_{2/3}-* / **k̑ruh_{2/3}-* through a trivial semantic concretization ‘hollowness, cavity’ ⇒ ‘hollow object’ ⇒ ‘reed’. Note that a comparable concretization ‘hollowness, cavity’ ⇒ ‘hollow object’ ⇒ ‘bone’ ⇒ ‘shinbone, shank’ also affected the coexisting *s*-stem PIE **k̑reuh_{2/3}-o/es-* > Lat. *crūs*, *-ris* n.

§ 3.3. Germanic

Finally, a further derivative of the reconstructed root PIE **k̑reuh_{2/3}-* ‘be(come) hollow’ might be identified in PGerm. **χreyḍa-* n. ‘reed’, for which no convincing etymology is available (§ 2.3 above with references). Assuming a segmentation **χrey-ḍa-*, one could reckon with two possible ancestors, namely, Pre-PGerm. **k̑reuh_{2/3}-t(-)ó-* or **k̑reuh_{2/3}-d^h(-)-o-*. These preforms allow several interpretations.

Starting from an AS root noun **k̑róuh_{2/3}-* / **k̑reuh_{2/3}-* (§ 3.1.3 above), Pre-PGerm. **k̑reuh_{2/3}-tó-* > **kreu-tó-* might be conceived of as a possessive derivative in **-tó-* (cf. the type Lat. *barbā-tus* ‘bearded’) of its weak stem **k̑reuh_{2/3}-*. However, since the root noun **k̑róuh_{2/3}-* / **k̑reuh_{2/3}-* would be expected to exhibit a resultative semantics ‘hollow(ed) object’ or similar, it would remain unclear how its supposed derivative **k̑reuh_{2/3}-tó-* could have developed a meaning ‘reed’ in the prehistory of Germanic.

Starting from a mobile root noun **k̑reuh_{2/3}-* / **k̑ruh_{2/3}-* ‘hollowness, cavity’ (§ 3.2.2 above), one could reconstruct a univerbated syntagm

substantivization (cf., among others, Nussbaum 1997: 194; Neri 2013: 198; Höfler 2017: 133–144).

PIE **kreu(h_{2/3})-d^hh₁-o-* ‘put in hollowness, hollow’⁴¹ > Pre-PGerm. **kreu-d^h(h₁)-o-* ‘hollow’, which would have acquired the attested semantics ‘reed’ through a substantivization process.

As a further alternative, one might surmise that the mobile root noun PIE **kreuh_{2/3}-* / **kruh_{2/3}-* ‘hollowness, cavity’ underwent a paradigm internal leveling in an early phase of Pre-Proto-Germanic, leading to the generalization of its strong stem **kreuh_{2/3}-*. Only thereafter, a possessive *tó*-adjective Pre-PGerm. **kreuh_{2/3}-tó-* ‘provided with hollowness, hollow’ → (unmarked substantivization) PGerm. **χreu-đa-* n. (‘hollow object’ ⇒) ‘reed’ would have been derived from it.

Accordingly, PGerm. **χreu-đa-* n. ‘reed’ – in conjunction with PCelt. **krou-o-* ‘hollow object, hole, cavity’ (§ 3.2.2 above) – may offer independent evidence for the reconstruction of a mobile root noun PIE **kreuh_{2/3}-* / **kruh_{2/3}-* ‘hollowness, cavity’, which should thus be regarded as the most likely source of B *karwa/o**, A **kru* ‘reed’. Note that – similarly to the case of Pre-Proto-Germanic (see immediately above) – a paradigm internal leveling of the root noun **kreuh_{2/3}-* / **kruh_{2/3}-* has to be assumed for the prehistory of Tocharian as well, although in the latter branch the weak stem **kruh_{2/3}-* rather than the strong stem **kreuh_{2/3}-* has been generalized (see § 3.1.3 above).

§ 3.4. Schematic summary

The morphological relations among the derivatives of the PIE root **kreuh_{2/3}-* ‘be(come) hollow’ can be summarized as in (2). The coexistence of a root noun beside an *s*-stem and a thematic adjective of the type **C(e)C-ó-* is appropriate for a PIE Caland root (cf. Rau 2009: 71, 72–73).

(2) Derivatives of the Caland root PIE **kreuh_{2/3}-* ‘be(come) hollow’

(A) Root noun PIE **kreuh_{2/3}-* / **kruh_{2/3}-* ‘hollowness, cavity’:

41 For parallel formations in PIE **o-d^hh₁-o-* and the laryngeal loss in the context PIE **-CHCC-*, see Hackstein 2002 and Kölligan 2018.

(i) >> Pre-PToch. **kruh*_{2/3}- ‘hollow object’: sg. nom. **kruh*_{2/3}-s / acc. **kruh*_{2/3}-m > **kruas* / **kru*’m > **krua* / **krum* >> **krua* / **krua* > PToch. **kärwa* / **kärwa* > (a) B sg. nom. *karwa** (>> *karwo**) / obl. *karwa** ‘a reed; reed wood’ (→ adjective B *kärwā-ṣṣe** ‘pertaining to a reed; (made) of reed (wood)’ ~ new pl. nom. *kärwā-ñ** / obl. *karwa-m**, (b) A sg. nom. **kärwā* / obl. **kärwā* > **kärw* / **kärw* > **kärü* / **kärü* > **kru* / **kru* ‘a reed; reed wood’ (→ adjective A *kärwā-ṣi** ‘(made) of reed (wood)’);

(ii) >> Pre-PGerm. **kreuh*_{2/3}- ‘hollowness, cavity’;
→ adjective Pre-PGerm. **kreuh*_{2/3}-tō- ‘hollow’ → (unmarked substantivization) PGerm. **χrey-ḍa-* n. (‘hollow object’ ⇒) ‘reed’ > OE *hrēod* n. ‘id.’, OHG *hriot* n. ‘id.’, etc.;

(iii) → adjective **kr(e)uh*_{2/3}-ó- ‘hollow’;
→ substantive Pre-PCelt. **kré/óuh*_{2/3}-o- ‘hollow object, hole, cavity’ > PCelt. **krou*-o- ‘id.’ > OIr. *cró* m. ‘socket, hoop (of lance); eye (of needle)’, W *crau* m. ‘hole, aperture; eye (of needle); helve’, MBret. *craou* m. ‘id.’, etc.;

(B) *s*-stem PIE **kréuh*_{2/3}-o/es- n. ‘hollowness, cavity’:

(i) > Pre-PIt. sg. nom. **kréuh*_{2/3}-os / gen. **kréuh*_{2/3}-a/os-es > PIt. **krou*-os / **krou*-a/os-es ‘hollow object’ > Lat. **krouus* / **krouus*-es > **krouis* / **krouis*-es > **krūs* / **krūs*-es > Lat. *crūs* / *crūr-is* n. ‘shinbone, shank; (lower) leg’;

(ii) ? → adjective **kruh*_{2/3}-s-nó- ‘provided with hollowness, hollow’;

? → substantive Pre-PArm. **kruh*_{2/3}-s-ni- ‘hollow object’ > PArm. **sruni-* > Arm. *srun-k^c* pl. ‘shinbone, shank’.

§ 4. Conclusions

In the present paper I have argued that the Tocharian words for ‘reed’ – directly attested only through the gen.pl. B *kärwa*= and (*kä*)*rw(a)ts* (= *kärwāmts** = /*kärwāntsä*/*) in archaic texts – belong to the nominal

class VI.3b: i.e., (i) B sg. nom. *karwa/o** / obl. *karwa** ~ pl. nom. *kärwāñ** / obl. *karwañ**; (ii) A sg. nom. **kru* / obl. **kru* (~ ? loc.sg. *kärw-am*) ~ (?) pl. nom. **kärwāñ* / obl. **kärwās*. B *karwa/o**, A **kru* exhibited not only a count semantics ‘a reed’ but also a mass semantics ‘reed wood / reed material’. This can be inferred from the secondary adjectives B *kärwā-ṣṣe** ‘pertaining to a (single) reed; (made) of reed (wood / material)’ and A *kärwā-ṣi** ‘(made) of reed (wood / material)’, which are derived from the obl.sg.-forms B *karwa**, A **kärwā* (> **kru*).

As for their diachronic background, B *karwa/o**, A **kru* ‘reed’ are etymologically related, but not formally identical to Lat. *crūs* / *crūr-is* n. ‘shinbone, shank; (lower) leg’ (~ Arm. *srun-k^c* pl. ‘id.’). Whereas Lat. *crūs* goes back to an *s*-stem PIE **kréh_{2/3}-o/es-* n. ‘hollowness, cavity’, the Tocharian forms continue a root noun PIE **kréh_{2/3}-* / **kruh_{2/3}-* ‘id.’, which also functioned as derivational base for the ancestor of PGerm. **χrey-ḍa-* n. (‘hollow object’ ⇒) ‘reed’ > OE *hrēod* n. ‘id.’, etc. All these forms point to an underlying Caland root PIE **kreu_h_{2/3}-* ‘(be)come hollow’, whose original semantics is still visible in the Celtic derivatives OIr. *cró* m. ‘socket; eye (of needle)’, W *crau* m. ‘hole, aperture; eye (of needle)’, etc., that go back to a substantive Pre-PCelt. **kré/óu_h_{2/3}-o-* ‘hollow object’.

Abbreviations

ALEW = Hock, Wolfgang et al., 2021: *Altltauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Version 2.0. <https://alew.hu-berlin.de/>.

CEToM = *A Comprehensive Edition of Tocharian Manuscripts*. <https://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/>.

DPEWA = Demiraj, Bardhyl; Hackstein Olav; Gashi, Plator; Imberciadori, Giulio; Neri, Sergio and Omari, Anila, 2021–: *Digitales Philologisch-Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altalbanischen (15.–18. Jh.)*. <https://www.dpwa.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/dictionary/?lemmaid=9538>.

DTA = Carling, Gerd, 2009: *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A*. Vol. 1: *A–J*. In collaboration with Georges-Jean Pinault and Werner Winter. Wiesbaden.

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

- EDAIL* = Martirosyan, Hrach, 2010: *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden/Boston.
- EDG* = Beekes, Robert S. P., 2010: *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. With the assistance of Lucien van Beek. 2 vols. Leiden/Boston.
- EDHIL* = Kloekhorst, Alwin, 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden/Boston.
- eDIL* = Toner, Gregory; Sharon, Arbuthnot; Ní Mhaonaigh, Máire; Theuerkauf, Marie-Luise and Wodtko, Dagmar S.: *electronic Dictionary of the Irish Language*. <http://www.dil.ie/>.
- EDLIL* = De Vaan, Michiel A. C., 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden/Boston.
- EDPC* = Matasović, Ranko, 2009: *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden/Boston.
- EDPG* = Kroonen, Guus, 2013: *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden/Boston.
- EDSIL* = Derksen, Rick, 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden/Boston.
- EWahd* = Lloyd, Albert L.; Springer, Otto; Purdy, Karen K. and Lühr, Rosemarie, 1988–2021: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen*. 7 vols. Göttingen/Zürich.
- EWaia* = Mayrhofer, Manfred, 1986–2001: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. 3 vols. Heidelberg.
- GPC* = Thomas, R. J.; Bevan, Gareth A. and Donovan, Patrick J.: *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.
- LEIA* = Vendryes, Joseph, 1959–1987: *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien*. 6 vols. Paris.
- LIV* = Rix, Helmut, 2001: *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. In collaboration with Martin J. Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp and Brigitte Schirmer. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden.
- 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/>.
- MW* = Monier-Williams, Monier, 1872: *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special References to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Oxford.

- NIL* = Wodtko, Dagmar S.; Irslinger, Britta and Schneider, Carolin, 2008: *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg.
- OED* = *Oxford English Dictionary. The Definitive Record of the English Language*. <https://www.oed.com/>.
- SWTF* = Waldschmidt, Ernst; Bechert, Heinz and Hartmann, Jens-Uwe, 1994–2018: *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden und der kanonischen Literatur der Sarvāstivāda-Schule*. 4 vols. Göttingen.
- TEB* = Krause, Wolfgang and Thomas, Werner, 1960–1964: *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. 2 vols. Heidelberg.
- TG* = Sieg, Emil and Siegling, Wilhelm, 1931: *Tocharische Grammatik*. In collaboration with Wilhelm Schulze. Göttingen.
- TLT* = Poucha, Pavel, 1955: *Thesaurus Linguae Tocharicae Dialecti A*. Praha.

References

- Adams, Douglas Q., 2006: Etymological Connections of the Tocharian Word for ‘Village’ and the Germanic Word for ‘House’. With Notes on Tocharian B *koṣkiye* ‘hut’, and *koṣko* ‘± reproach’. In: *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 24, 390–400.
- 2013: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam/New York.
- Baetke, Walter, 1976: *Wörterbuch zur altnordischen Prosaliteratur*. 2nd ed. Darmstadt.
- Bartholomae, Christian, 1904: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Straßburg.
- Bernard, Chams Benoît and Chen, Ruixuan, 2022: A Fall into the Pit. Remarks on Tocharian B *koṣko*, *koṣkiye*. In: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 65, 1–31.
- Büthe-Scheider, Eva and Kölligan, Daniel, 2018: Germanisch **kreūda-* und Verwandtes. In: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 123, 1–25.
- Čop, Bojan, 1966–1968: Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung V. In: *Linguistica* 8/2, 165–175.
- Del Tomba, Alessandro, 2023: *The Tocharian Gender System: A Diachronic Study in Nominal Morphology*. Leiden/Boston.
- Demiraj, Bardhyl, 1997: *Albanische Etymologien: Untersuchungen zum albanischen Erbwortschatz*. Amsterdam/Atlanta.
- Driessen, Michiel C., 2001: On the Etymology of Lat. *urbs*. In: *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 29/1–2, 41–68.
- Hackstein, Olav, 1998: Tocharisch und Westindogermanisch: strukturell uneinheitliche Laryngalreflexe im Tocharischen (uridg. **-Uh₁C-* vs. **-*

- Uh_{2,3}(C-) und *#h₁RC- vs. *#h_{2,3}RC-). In: *Sprachen und Kultur der Indogermanen. Akten der X. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Innsbruck, 22.–28. September 1996*. Ed. by Wolfgang Meid. Innsbruck, 217–236.*
- 2002: Uridg. *CH.CC > *C.CC. In: *Historische Sprachforschung* 115, 1–22.
- 2011: Lateinisch *nūntius*. In: *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 65, 105–121.
- Hamp, Eric P., 1991: Notes on three Tocharian Words. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 5, 135–136.
- Harðarson, Jón Axel, 2018: Germanisch *truwa-, *trewwa und *trewwija- und ihre indogermanische Grundlage. In: *Priscis Libentius et Liberius Novis. Indogermanische und sprachwissenschaftliche Studien. Festschrift für Gerhard Meiser zum 65. Geburtstag*. Ed. by Olav Hackstein and Andreas Opfermann. Hamburg, 229–263.
- Hilmarsson, Jörundur, 1986: *Studies in Tocharian Phonology, Morphology and Etymology with Special Emphasis on the o-Vocalism*. PhD Diss. Leiden.
- 1987: The element -ai(-) in the Tocharian nominal flexion. In: *Die Sprache* 33, 34–55.
- 1989: West Tocharian *särwāna* “face”. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 3, 77–89.
- 1993: Development of labiovelars (and tectals plus *ɣ*) in initial position in Tocharian (an overview). In: *Die Sprache* 35, 176–186.
- 1996: *Materials for a Tocharian Historical and Etymological Dictionary*. Reykjavík.
- Höfler, Stefan, 2017: *Der Stier der Stärke hat. Possessive Adjektive und ihre Substantivierung im Indogermanischen*. PhD Diss. Wien.
- Huard, Athanaric, 2022: *Recherches sur les textes de méditation en tokharien*. PhD Diss. Paris.
- Imberciadori, Giulio, 2022: The Bright Ligurians. In: *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 57/1, 81–97.
- Isebaert, Lambert, 1980: *De Indo-Iraanse bestanddelen in de Tocharische woordenschat. Vraagstukken van fonische productinterferentie, met bijzondere aandacht voor de Indo-Iraanse diafonen a, ā*. PhD Diss. Leuven.
- Itkin, Ilya, 2011: Review of “Carling, Gerd et al., *Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A*”. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12, 243–253.
- Jasanoff, Jay H., 2018: The Phonology of Tocharian B *okso* ‘ox’. In: *Farnah: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honour of Sasha Lubotsky*. Ed.

- by Lucien van Beek, Alwin Kloekhorst and Guus Kroonen. Ann Arbor/New York, 72–78.
- Kim, Ronald I., 1999: The Development of Labiovelars in Tocharian: A Closer Look. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 8, 139–187.
- Kölligan, Daniel, 2018: Funktionsverbgefüge und Sekundärwurzeln. In: *100 Jahre Entzifferung des Hethitischen. Morphosyntaktische Kategorien in Sprachgeschichte und Forschung. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 23. September 2015 in Marburg*. Ed. by Elisabeth Rieken. Wiesbaden, 219–230.
- Leumann, Manu, 1977: *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München.
- Malyshev, Sergey V., 2019: A Sanskrit-Tocharian A bilingual text of the *Cīvaravastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya*. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 19, 71–92.
- Malzahn, Melanie, 2011: Speaking on tongue – the Tocharian B nouns with an oblique singular in *-a*. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12, 83–109.
- Meiser, Gerhard, 1998: *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. 2nd ed. Darmstadt.
- Meunier, Fanny, 2015: Some aspects of the translation of Sanskrit compounds into Tocharian. In: *Tocharian Texts in Context. International Conference on Tocharian Manuscripts and Silk Road Culture, Vienna, June 25–29th, 2013*. Ed. by Melanie Malzahn, Hannes A. Fellner, Michaël Peyrot and Theresa-Susanna Illés. Bremen, 137–148.
- Neri, Sergio, 2003: *I sostantivi in -u del gotico: morfologia e preistoria*. Innsbruck.
- 2013: Zum urindogermanischen Wort für ‚Hand‘. In: *Multi Nominis Grammaticus. Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in honor of Alan J. Nussbaum, on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Ed. by Adam I. Cooper, Jeremy Rau and Michael L. Weiss. Ann Arbor, 185–205.
- Nikolaev, Alexander, 2012–2013: Homeric ἀάατος: Etymology and Poetics. In: *Die Sprache* 50, 182–239.
- Nussbaum, Alan J., 1976: *Caland's "Law" and the Caland System*. PhD Diss. Harvard.
- 1997: The “Saussure effect” in Latin and Italic. In: *Sound Law and Analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S. P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday*. Ed. by Alexander Lubotsky. Amsterdam, 181–203.
- 1999: *Jocidus: an account of the Latin adjectives in *-idus*. In: *Compositiones indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Ed. by Heiner Eichner

- and Hans Christian Luschützky, in collaboration with Velizar Sadovski. Praha, 377–419.
- 2022: Classical Latin *iūdicāre* and Corcolle IOUOSDICA-: Can You Get Here from There?. In: *Ha! Linguistic Studies in Honor of Mark R. Hale*. Ed. by Laura Grestenberger, Charles Reiss, Hannes A. Fellner and Gabriel Z. Pantillon. Wiesbaden, 285–297.
- Olsen, Birgit Anette, 1999: *The Noun in Biblical Armenian: Origin and Word-Formation – with Special Emphasis on the Indo-European Heritage*. Berlin/New York.
- Peyrot, Michaël, 2008: *Variation and change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam/New York.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean, 1988: Révision des fragments en tokharien B de la légende de Mahāprabhāsa. In: *Studia Indogermanica et Slavica. Festgabe für Werner Thomas*. Ed. by Peter Kosta. München, 175–210.
- 2002 [2006]: Sur l'évolution phonétique *tsk* > *tk* en tokharien commun. In: *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 62, 103–156.
- 2004: Zum Tocharischen in der Turfanforschung. In: *Turfan Revisited: The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road (International Conference, Berlin/Dahlem, September 8–13, 2002)*. Ed. by Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst et al. Berlin, 259–263.
- 2008: *Chrestomathie Tokharienne. Textes et grammaire*. Leuven/Paris.
- 2016: Glossary of the Tocharian B Petrovsky Buddhastotra. In: *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 17, 213–247.
- Pinault, Jord, 1961: *KRĀWO- et *WĀLO-, *WALI- dans les langues celtiques. In: *Ogam* 8/1, 599–614.
- Rau, Jeremy, 2009: *Indo-European Nominal Morphology: The Decads and the Caland System*. Innsbruck.
- Ringe, Donald A., 1996: *On the Chronology of Sound Changes in Tocharian*. Vol. 1: *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Tocharian*. New Haven, Connecticut.
- Schindler, Jochem, 1972: L'apophonie des nomes-racines indo-européens. In: *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 67, 31–38.
- 1980: Zur Herkunft der altindischen "cvi-Bildungen". In: *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie: Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Wien, 24.–29. September 1978*. Ed. by Manfred Mayrhofer. Wiesbaden, 386–393.
- Schmidt, Klaus Totila, 1974: *Die Gebrauchsweisen des Mediums im Tocharischen*. PhD Diss. Göttingen.

- 1989: *Der Schlußteil des Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins: Text in Sanskrit und Tocharisch A verglichen mit den Parallelversionen anderer Schulen*. Göttingen.
- Sieg, Emil and Siegling, Wilhelm, 1953: *Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B. Heft 2: Fragmente Nr. 71–633*. Göttingen.
- Stüber, Karin, 2002: *Die primären s-Stämme des Indogermanischen*. Wiesbaden.
- Thomas, Werner, 1957: *Der Gebrauch der Vergangenheitstempora im Tocharischen*. Wiesbaden.
- 1973: Zur tocharischen Übersetzung der Sanskrit-Nominalkomposita des Udānavarga. In: *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 87, 161–189.
- 1985: *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen (1960–1984)*. Stuttgart.
- Van Windekens, Albert J., 1976: *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes*. Vol. 1: *La phonétique et le vocabulaire*. Louvain.
- 1979: *Le Tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes*. Vol. 2.1: *La morphologie nominale*. Louvain.
- Vine, Brent, 1999: On ‘Cowgill’s Law’ in Greek. In: *Compositiones indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Ed. by Heiner Eichner and Hans Christian Luschützky, in collaboration with Velizar Sadovski. Praha, 555–600.
- 2022: Myc. *tu-wo*, Hom. *θύος* and the vocalism of *s*-stems in Proto-Indo-European. In: *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* 18/1, 444–462.
- Weiss, Michael L., 2020: *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor/New York.
- Winter, Werner, 1997: Lexical archaisms in the Tocharian languages. In: *Historical, Indo-European, and Lexicographical Studies. A Festschrift for Ladislav Zgusta on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*. Ed. by Hans H. Hock. Berlin/New York, 183–193.
- Yates, Anthony D., 2022: Emergent Mobility in Indo-European **-r/n*-stems and Its Implications for the Reconstruction of the Neuter Plural. In: *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, November 5th, 6th and 7th, 2021*. Ed. by David M. Goldstein, Stephanie W. Jamison and Brent Vine, in collaboration with Angelo Mercado. Hamburg, 271–295.
- Zair, Nicholas, 2012: *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Celtic*. Leiden/Boston.
- 2017: The origins of *-urC-* for expected *-orC-* in Latin. In: *Glotta* 93, 255–289.

Giulio Imberciadori

Lehrstuhl für Historische und Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

giulio.imberciadori@gmail.com